BERLIN
DR

UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
39001018129372

NEW GUIDES TO OLD MASTERS

JOHN C. VAN DYKE

FOR REFERENCE
R708
V285
DISCARDED BY
TUCSON PUBLIC LIBRARY
NOT TO BE TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM
OP 8/83
CARNEGIE FREE LIBRARY
TUCSON, ARIZONA

The Freeman Bequest

1919

NEW GUIDES TO OLD MASTERS

By John C. Van Dyke

		PRICE
I.	*London*—National Gallery, Wallace Collection. With a General Introduction and Bibliography for the Series	*net* $1.00
II.	*Paris*—Louvre	*net* .75
III.	*Amsterdam*—Rijks Museum *The Hague*—Royal Gallery *Haarlem*—Hals Museum } bound together .	*net* .75
IV.	*Brussels*—Royal Museum *Antwerp*—Royal Museum } bound together .	*net* .75
V.	*Munich*—Old Pinacothek *Frankfort*—Staedel Institute *Cassel*—Royal Gallery } bound together .	*net* 1.00
VI.	*Berlin*—Kaiser-Friedrich Museum *Dresden*—Royal Gallery } bound together .	*net* 1.00
VII.	*Vienna*—Imperial Gallery *Budapest*—Museum of Fine Arts } bound together .	*net* 1.00
VIII.	*St. Petersburg*—Hermitage	*In Press*
IX.	*Venice*—Academy *Milan*—Brera, Poldi-Pezzoli } bound together .	*In Press*
X.	*Florence*—Uffizi, Pitti, Academy	*In Press*
XI.	*Rome*—Vatican, Borghese Gallery	*In Press*
XII.	*Madrid*—Prado	*In Press*

KAISER-FRIEDRICH MUSEUM

ROYAL GALLERY, DRESDEN

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/newguidestooldma0000john

Photographische Gesellschaft, Berlin

GIORGIONE: PORTRAIT OF A MAN
Kaiser-Friedrich Museum, Berlin

NEW GUIDES TO OLD MASTERS

BERLIN, DRESDEN

CRITICAL NOTES ON THE KAISER-FRIEDRICH MUSEUM AND THE ROYAL GALLERY, DRESDEN

BY

JOHN C. VAN DYKE

AUTHOR OF "ART FOR ART'S SAKE," "THE MEANING OF PICTURES," "HISTORY OF PAINTING," "OLD DUTCH AND FLEMISH MASTERS," ETC.

NEW YORK
CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS
1914

COPYRIGHT, 1914, BY
CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS

Published May, 1914

CARNEGIE FREE LIBRARY
TUCSON, ARIZONA

PREFACE TO THE SERIES

THERE are numerous guide-books, catalogues, and histories of the European galleries, but, unfortunately for the gallery visitor, they are either wholly descriptive of obvious facts or they are historical and archæological about matters somewhat removed from art itself. In them the gist of a picture—its value or meaning as art—is usually passed over in silence. It seems that there is some need of a guide that shall say less about the well-worn saints and more about the man behind the paint-brush; that shall deal with pictures from the painter's point of view, rather than that of the ecclesiastic, the archæologist, or the literary romancer; that shall have some sense of proportion in the selection and criticism of pictures; that shall have a critical basis for discrimination between the good and the bad; and that shall, for these reasons, be of service to the travelling public as well as to the art student.

This series of guide-books attempts to meet these requirements. They deal only with the so-called "old masters." When the old masters came upon the scene, flourished, and ceased to exist may be determined by their spirit as well as by their dates. In Italy the tradition of the craft had been established before Giotto and was carried on by Benozzo, Botti-

celli, Raphael, Titian, Tintoretto, even down to Tiepolo in the eighteenth century. But the late men, the men of the Decadence, are not mentioned here because of their exaggerated sentiment, their inferior workmanship—in short, the decay of the tradition of the craft. In France the fifteenth-century primitives are considered, and also the sixteenth-century men, including Claude and Poussin; but the work of the Rigauds, Mignards, Coypels, Watteaus, and Bouchers seems of a distinctly modern spirit and does not belong here. This is equally true of all English painting from Hogarth to the present time. In Spain we stop with the School of Velasquez, in Germany and the Low Countries with the seventeenth-century men. The modern painters, down to the present day, so far as they are found in the public galleries of Europe, will perhaps form a separate guide-book, which by its very limitation to modern painting can be better treated by itself.

Only the best pictures among the old masters are chosen for comment. This does not mean, however, that only the great masterpieces have been considered. There are, for instance, notes upon some three hundred pictures in the Venice Academy, upon five hundred in the Uffizi Gallery, and some six hundred in the Louvre or the National Gallery, London. Other galleries are treated in the same proportion. But it has not been thought worth while to delve deeply into the paternity of pictures by third-rate primitives or

to give space to mediocre or ruined examples by even celebrated painters. The merits that now exist in a canvas, and can be seen by any intelligent observer, are the features insisted upon herein.

In giving the relative rank of pictures, a system of starring has been followed.

Mention without a star indicates a picture of merit, otherwise it would not have been selected from the given collection at all.

One star (*) means a picture of more than average importance, whether it be by a great or by a mediocre painter.

Two stars (**) indicates a work of high rank as art, quite regardless of its painter's name, and may be given to a picture attributed to a school or by a painter unknown.

Three stars (***) signifies a great masterpiece.

The length of each note and its general tenor will in most cases suggest the relative importance of the picture.

Catalogues of the galleries should be used in connection with these guide-books, for they contain much information not repeated here. The gallery catalogues are usually arranged alphabetically under the painters' names, although there are some of them that make reference by school, or room, or number, according to the hanging of the pictures in the gallery. But the place where the picture may be hung is constantly shifting; its number, too, may be subject to alteration with each new edition of the catalogue; but its painter's

name is perhaps less liable to change. An arrangement, therefore, by the painters' names placed alphabetically has been necessarily adopted in these guide-books. Usually the prefixes "de," "di," "van," and "von" have been disregarded in the arrangement of the names. And usually, also, the more familiar name of the artist is used—that is, Botticelli, not Filipepi; Correggio, not Allegri; Tintoretto, not Robusti. In practical use the student can ascertain from the picture-frame the name of the painter and turn to it alphabetically in this guide-book. In case the name has been recently changed, he can take the number from the frame and, by turning to the numerical index at the end of each volume, can ascertain the former name and thus the alphabetical place of the note about that particular picture.

The picture appears under the name or attribution given in the catalogue. If there is no catalogue, then the name on the frame is taken. But that does not necessarily mean that the name or attribution is accepted in the notes. Differences of view are given very frequently. It is important that we should know the painter of the picture before us. The question of attribution is very much in the air to-day, and considerable space is devoted to it not only in the General Introduction but in the notes themselves. Occasionally, however, the whole question of authorship is passed over in favour of the beauty of the picture itself. It is always the art of the picture we are seeking, more than its name, or pedigree, or commercial value.

Conciseness herein has been a necessity. These notes are suggestions for study or thought rather than complete statements about the pictures. Even the matter of an attribution is often dismissed in a sentence though it may have been thought over for weeks. If the student would go to the bottom of things he must read further and do some investigating on his own account. The lives of the painters, the history of the schools, the opinions of the connoisseurs may be read elsewhere. A bibliography, in the London volume, will suggest the best among the available books in both history and criticism.

The proper test of a guide-book is its use. These notes were written in the galleries and before the pictures. I have not trusted my memory about them, nor shall I trust the memory of that man who, from his easy chair, declares he knows the pictures by heart. The opinions and conclusions herein have not been lightly arrived at. Indeed, they are the result of more than thirty years' study of the European galleries. That they are often diametrically opposed to current views and beliefs should not be cause for dismissing them from consideration. Examine the pictures, guide-book in hand. That is the test to which I submit and which I exact.

Yet with this insistence made, one must still feel apologetic or at least sceptical about results. However accurate one would be as to fact, it is obviously impossible to handle so many titles, names, and numbers

without an occasional failure of the eye or a slip of the pen; and however frankly fair in criticism one may fancy himself, it is again impossible to formulate judgments on, say, ten thousand pictures without here and there committing blunders. These difficulties may be obviated in future editions. If opinions herein are found to be wrong, they will be edited out of the work just as quickly as errors of fact. The reach is toward a reliable guide though the grasp may fall short of full attainment.

It remains to be said that I am indebted to Mr. and Mrs. George B. McClellan for helpful suggestions regarding this series, and to Mr. Sydney Philip Noe not only for good counsel but for practical assistance in copying manuscript and reading proof.

JOHN C. VAN DYKE.

RUTGERS COLLEGE, 1914.

KAISER-FRIEDRICH MUSEUM

NOTE ON THE KAISER-FRIEDRICH MUSEUM

Almost every student of art will testify to the excellence of the Kaiser-Friedrich Museum as a place for study. It is the most satisfactory gallery in Europe in this respect. This is not alone due to its large variety of pictures but to the proper showing of the pictures and the excellent arrangement of the gallery. The building is new and was specially designed for a museum. The rooms vary in size and avoid monotony; the lighting is very good and the walls in neutral tints are inconspicuous. The pictures are arranged in rooms by schools and countries, and with them are placed bronzes, bas-reliefs, friezes, doorways, hangings, chairs, tables, chests—things of the period that give a setting, a *milieu*, for the pictures. The effect is to put one back in the days of the old masters and to quicken comprehension of art motives and methods. In the central part of the building is an Italian church arrangement with chapels, altars and altar-pieces, coats of arms, hangings that recall the Italian churches and show how art was used in them. These are decided innovations in museum management and they are very successful.

How successful every one knows who remembers the

pictures as they appeared in the old museum. When they were taken to the new building and hung in their present places they were hardly recognisable so astonishingly had they improved in appearance. In the early days the gallery was considered excellent in the representation of the schools but not remarkable for its masterpieces; but to-day one realises that some of these same pictures are really great works. Add to this improvement in the setting of the pictures the constant gathering in of new and important works and you have one of the most notable collections of paintings in existence.

The gallery, as a whole, has been made by purchase within the last century. The Giustiniani Collection, bought in 1815, the Solly Collection, bought in 1821, a selection of pictures from the royal palaces in 1829 formed the nucleus; but the later additions, including the Suermondt Collection in 1874, and purchases of individual works from collectors and at auction sales have made the museum not only famous but of the greatest importance to the student. For the policy of making the collection illustrative of the entire history of art is still in force. There are now here many examples of painters not seen elsewhere, and the filling-in process, completing the representation of each school, is still going on. The Berlin Museum is possibly more active in making acquisitions than any gallery in Europe.

As one goes through the gallery he is perhaps amazed at the great number of notable pictures. Especially

is this true of the pictures in the Italian Schools. There are two rooms filled with Primitives and many pictures by such fifteenth-century men as Squarcione, Mantegna, Antonello da Messina, Bellini, Cima, Tura, Cossa, Zoppo, Piero di Cosimo, Signorelli, Pollajuolo, Filippino, Fra Filippo, Botticelli, Domenico Veneziano. Nothing could be finer than the works by some of these men—especially the great altar-piece by Tura, the excellent Mantegnas, the fine profile by Domenico Veneziano, the rare Madonna by Squarcione, the powerful Signorelli tondo. Among the sixteenth-century masters there is a group of five Raphaels, all of them early; a famous Correggio; two excellent Lottos; half a dozen Titians, of which three at least are masterful in every way; a romantic Giorgione portrait (shown as the frontispiece to this volume); one superb Palma; some fine Tintorettos; and an entire room decoration by Tiepolo.

This remarkable representation of the Italians does not eclipse or dwarf the Early Flemish School of which there are many examples, beginning with the greater part of the celebrated St. Bavon altar-piece by the Van Eycks. Bouts is here in all his glory of colour, with Christus, Memling, Van der Weyden, Metsys, Gossart. Here, too, is a fine picture by a rare master, Ouwater, and two panels by an equally rare painter and past master of technique, Marmion. Of the later Flemings there are twenty-six pictures put down to Rubens, some of them of the finest quality, and a dozen examples of Van Dyck, some of these again being

in his best style. The German Schools are very much in evidence, though the early altar-pieces such as the Munich Gallery possesses are scarce. Altdorfer, Burgkmair, Cranach, are well shown—the last-named in one or two astonishing panels. Holbein and Dürer are, of course, present in half a dozen examples.

Among the minor Dutchmen there is a beautiful picture of a Lady with Pearls by Vermeer of Delft, a fine Terborch, several excellent Brouwers, Ostades, Steens, an unusual Keyser, a strong Rembrandtesque Backer, a dozen Ruisdaels. Hals is credited with a number of fine pictures but one cannot be certain that he did them all. This is equally true of the twenty-six Rembrandts. Among them are a few works of great power; for instances, the Man with the Golden Helmet and the Portrait of Hendrickje Stoffels; but the majority of them are disappointing as art and their origin with Rembrandt is by no means beyond dispute.

The catalogue (in German) is concise, accurate, and scholarly. One may not always agree with its conclusions or its attributions and yet have a profound respect for its opinions. It has been prepared with care and is subject to continual revision. It is arranged alphabetically under the painters' names. Some editions carry illustrations. One expensive volume has illustrations of every picture in the gallery belonging to the Northern Schools. Photographs are sold at the door. Hanfstaengl has a volume of reproductions of the pictures to be had for a few marks.

KAISER-FRIEDRICH MUSEUM

719. **Aertsen, Pieter.** ***Young Woman and Child.*** Rather coarsely done and savagely drawn, giving an inadequate notion of Aertsen as he is to be seen at Brussels, for instance. But there is vigorous work about it and in it. Perhaps a part of an altar-piece.

1076. **Alegretto Nuzi.** ***Madonna with Two Saints.*** An excellent example of early Umbrian work in good condition. The colour of the robe and the patterns at the back should be noticed. The Christ on the Cross (No. 1078) is of the same character. Both of them are pyramidal compositions.

638B. **Altdorfer, Albrecht.** ***Rest in Egypt.*** A beautiful piece of colour disturbed by too many stick-like details at the right. The landscape is most interesting as also the small angels on the edge of the fountain. Notice the drawing of the mountain forms in the distance.

638. ——***St. Francis and St. Jerome.*** The landscapes are rather fine in colour if a little restless. The figures belong with them and are parts of them, for Altdorfer was perhaps more of a landscape painter than a figure painter.

638E. ——***The Birth of Christ.*** It is quaint and Germanic in conception not only as to the ruin but as to the singing angels in the sky and even the sun. But what fine art it is! In the painter's middle period.

638c. ——***Landscape with Figures.*** A masterful little piece that tells an unusual narrative or illustrates a proverb in the beggars riding on the royal train. What strange architecture and what an interesting landscape!

638d. ——***Crucifixion.*** Beautiful in the colour of the robes, the figures on the crosses, and in the landscape. See also the landscape No. 638a. All of Altdorfer's works are worthy of study, for he has the true spirit of art. Never mind about his Germanic types—that is, do not be disturbed by them. They are to be admired for their sincerity and truth to a point of view.

556. **Amberger, Christoph.** ***Portrait of Charles V.*** This is a different personality from Titian's Charles V, and is suggestive of what the personal and national equation may do in portraiture. The type is Germanic, the lower jaw thin and protrusive, the face white. The colour of the picture has a bleached look suggestive of cleaning and repainting.

583. ——***Portrait of Sebastian Münster.*** It is too woolly in texture and lacks in firmness of drawing, although cleaning and restoring may be responsible for this. The colour is a little crude.

60. **Angelico, Fra.** ***Madonna and Child Enthroned.*** A large picture but not so good in either sentiment or colour as the smaller No. 61. It is evidently an early work—possibly a school piece.

61. ——***Saints Dominic and Francis.*** Very pure and lovely in the sentiment of the figures and very charming in the meeting of the colours of sky and church roof. Notice the pretty though immaturely painted landscape at the left. Notice also above it the kneeling Madonna with her blue robe against

the blue sky—a fine study in painters' values for an early Renaissance painter. See also No. 62 as a study in browns. Both panels are parts of a predella.

60A. * ——*The Last Judgment.* A characteristic example of Fra Angelico. The heaven at the left with the angels and flowers is the best part of it. Notice the ring of angels dancing below, and especially the angel in the magenta robe with a wreath of flowers on the head. Notice also the rising lines and circles of angels leading toward the top of the panel. All the robes are beautiful and all the faces very pure in their religious sentiment. The hell at the right-hand corner is not good in colour and hurts the picture. Possibly worked upon by pupils in parts—the hell, for instance.

18. **Antonello da Messina.** ***Portrait of a Young Man.*** It has not the strength of the Louvre picture (No. 1134) nor the colour of the National Gallery portrait (No. 1141), but is a very true, honest, and frank work of much excellence. The drawing of the face outline, the turn of the eyes, the painting of the hair are in Antonello's usual manner and done almost perfectly. See the perhaps better example, No. 18A. This picture is on wood and in good condition.

18A. * ——***Portrait of a Young Man.*** Clear in drawing and superb in dignity. What character it has! And what force! Compare the drawing of the mouth with the mouth of the Botticelli (No. 78) in this gallery. Both are firmly drawn. The colour is simple, but how could it be more appropriate, more in keeping with the sitter?

25. **Antonello da Messina, School of.** ***Portrait of a Young Man.*** It is rather poorly done, especially in the hair, the eyes, the mouth, the face outline. Antonello might possibly have done it, though it is more likely by some follower. Even the colour lacks in quality.

1640. **Backer, Jacob Adriaensz.** ***Portrait of an Old Lady.*** A very good example of Backer, a pupil of Rembrandt. It might easily pass as a Rembrandt with the uncritical. It has not, however, Rembrandt's firmness of drawing nor certainty of touch, but is, nevertheless, a fine portrait. It is in the style of Rembrandt's Elizabeth Bas, at Amsterdam, which one Rembrandt authority thinks should be given to Bol.

603A. **Baldung (Grien), Hans.** ***Adoration of Kings.*** A large triptych, rather savage in its bright colouring and not quite satisfactory in the drawing of hands and robes, or in the texture, say, of the armour in the wings. It is done with sincerity but not with the skill and power usually shown by Baldung.

603. ——***Crucifixion.*** This is better than No. 603A, but still is somewhat crude though honest work. The flesh has a washed-out look, and the strength of tragic passion that goes occasionally with this painter is not so apparent here as in No. 603B, hanging near by. Notice the drawing of the tree trunks and the distant height.

249. **Bartolommeo, Fra.** ***Ascension of Madonna.*** (An altar-piece in the chapel down-stairs.) Large and rather good in colour but meagre in the types. The drawing is not of the best, especially in the upper figures, which do not speak for Fra Barto-

lommeo. They are by some assistant. Also the aureole back of the Madonna is a little sweet in colour. The robes of the saints are well done and have good colour, and the landscape is excellent in its sweep and serenity. The picture looks unusually well in its present placing, because the chapel gives approximately the setting for which the picture was originally designed.

1664. **Bartolommeo Veneto.** ***Portrait of a German.*** It is probably the work of a German showing Venetian influence of the Bellini time. The landscape is half-German, and the type of the sitter is Germanic. A good portrait, somewhat hurt by repainting in the neck and elsewhere. (Now [1913] placed under the Venetian School.)

37. **Basaiti, Marco.** ***St. Sebastian.*** The figure is weak in drawing and affected in sentiment. At the back is a river scene with buildings and figures. The picture has been much restored but was never very good. It is by a pseudo-Basaiti perhaps.

4. **Basaiti, Pseudo-.** ***Pietà.*** Compare the head and figures of the Christ and John here with the heads and figures of the two soldiers at the bottom of No. 1177A, put down to Bellini (but probably by Basaiti), for resemblances of types and drawing. This picture was formerly attributed to Bellini but is probably nearer to Basaiti than any one else. It has good colour and strong light-and-shade about the head of the Christ. The sky is a bit blue. Injured by restorations. Many versions elsewhere.

1180. **Bellini, Gentile.** ***Madonna, Child, and Donors.*** To be accepted with reservations. It is in Gentile's style, but too much injured to make positive

identification possible. The woman donor at the right is suggestive of Gentile, but this is not conclusive.

10A. **Bellini, Giovanni.** ***Madonna and Child.*** Somewhat heavy and wanting in inspiration. The figures are flat from over-cleaning—the under headdress of the Madonna having almost disappeared. The contrast of the red and blue is violent. It is possibly a school piece.

11. ——***Madonna and Child.*** Long of neck and dull in sentiment, with some bad drawing in the hands and no very profound colour. It is probably a school piece, in common with No. 10. The signature means merely that a name was necessary to carry the picture.

28. * ——***Dead Christ with Angels.*** The subject is somewhat forbidding, but the figure is very lovely in its hard drawing, and the angels are pathetic in their grief. An oval composition in a square, the heads forming the top of the oval, and the arms and hands of Christ the sides and bottom. The colour is decidedly fine but the sentiment of it is finer. It is the most satisfactory Bellini in this gallery but by no means up to the later Pietà at the Brera (No. 214). Somewhat repainted.

1177. ——***Madonna and Child.*** It shows the influence of Mantegna in the Child and landscape and is perhaps of Bellini workshop origin. Another version in the Museo Civico, Verona.

1177A. ——***The Resurrection of Christ.*** This picture has at various times been listed as a Cima, a Basaiti, a Bartolommeo Veneziano, and now as a Giovanni Bellini. The documentary evidence for its pres-

ent attribution is of some value, but the internal evidence of the picture is contradictory of it. Its tree drawing, rocks, buildings, and general landscape effect with mountains are those of Basaiti. Compare them with those in the Basaiti (No. 599), in the National Gallery, London, and No. 69, of the Venice Academy. They are all the same in kind. Also compare the heads and types with those of the Basaiti No. 4 and the Carpaccio No. 23A (a pseudo-Basaiti), in this gallery. They are Basaiti heads and types. There are other features peculiar to Basaiti, as, for instance, the white spot made by the warrior's white trousers at the right, the rocks, the dead tree and the bird, the dark hair of Christ, the white flag near it. The sleeping soldiers are only faintly Bellinesque, whereas their position under a rock is like that in the Basaiti (No. 69), in the Venice Academy as well as in the Marconi (No. 166) (another Basaiti), in the same gallery. The work is too coarse for Bellini. Notice this in the heads of the soldiers or the women at the back. The picture should be looked at closely.

12. **Bellini, School of Giovanni.** ***Two Venetians.*** This is by the painter of the heads in the Louvre (No. 1156), put down there to Gentile Bellini, but in reality by Cariani. These are rather weak heads, and the workmanship is not distinguished in any way. Compare them for resemblances with No. 188 in this gallery, by Cariani.

N. N. **Bellini, Jacopo** (?). ***Mourning Over the Christ.*** Whether it be by Jacopo Bellini or not, it is in the same vein and spirit as the Bastiani (No. 1170A) hanging near it and may serve for comparison

with it. The same tragic quality with harshness of drawing and strength of colouring is apparent. They are by no means of identical origin, except perhaps geographically. A work of some force and feeling though the catalogue queries the attribution.

60B. **Benozzo Gozzoli.** ***Madonna and Child.*** This gives one but a small idea of Benozzo. It is heavy in the drawing of the figures, harsh in the Madonna's robe, and not brilliant in either gold or colours.

60C. ——***St. Zenobius Raising a Dead Child.*** The child walking forward is naïve in treatment, as is indeed the whole scene. There are some good heads here and some rather brilliant colours. Part of a predella. See the catalogue note upon it.

132. **Bertucci, Giovanni Battista.** ***Adoration of Kings.*** An Umbrian picture of much interest in the expansive landscape at back. Notice the fine group of trees at right and the distant hills through the arch. The figures are slight.

1182. **Bianchi, Francesco.** ***Madonna with Four Saints.*** It shows the thin, angular types and liny drapery with the white medallion of the Ferrarese, and yet there is some doubt if the picture is of Ferrarese origin. Good in colour and ornate in the mosaics of the arch.

43. **Bissolo, Francesco.** ***Resurrection.*** It lacks quality in the white of the robe of the Christ, and has little character in the types, the drawing, or the handling. How soft the face of the Christ!

624. **Bles, Herri met de.** ***Portrait of a Young Man.*** Apparently the only reason for assigning this por-

trait to Bles is the owl on the tree at right. Even the catalogue doubts the attribution. If this is Bles then everything else in every other gallery that we have thought was Bles is wrongly assigned. See the notes on Bles in the Vienna Gallery.

1616. **Boccati, Giovanni.** ***The Three Angels and Tobit.*** Never mind the lax drawing or the faces; but look at it as a spot of colour with gold as an added note. It is really fine. The attribution is largely a guess, but you need not mind that either.

809A. **Bol, Ferdinand.** ***Portrait of a Young Man.*** This idealised young man is somehow related to the angel in Rembrandt's Jacob Wrestling with the Angel (No. 828) on the opposite wall. The relation is more than superficial, for the same face appears in Bol's Abraham Receiving the Visit of the Angels (No. 552), in Amsterdam. The catalogue casts doubt upon it, but it is a true enough though rather insipid Bol. See the note on the Rembrandt, No. 828.

207. **Boltraffio, Giovanni Antonio.** ***St. Barbara.*** Somewhat exaggerated in the figure, heavy in the draperies, and crude in the landscape but with good feeling and good colour.

137A. **Bonfigli, Benedetto.** ***Madonna Enthroned.*** A pretty bit of gold and colour, with a tall Madonna and small angels. Notice the blue high lights on the red robe of the angel at the right.

46C. **Bonsignori, Francesco.** ***St. Sebastian.*** Stained and much changed in colour, in the sky as well as in the figure, but still a strong piece of drawing. With a stern and rugged mountain landscape at the back that emphasises the rugged conception

and drawing of St. Sebastian. It is effective at a distance. Bonsignori's best pictures are at Verona. See also here, No. 40, with the catalogue note upon it.

169. **Bordone, Paris.** ***The Chess-Players.*** It is injured but still has an effective landscape and fine architecture. It gives one small idea of Bordone as he is seen in the Venice Academy.

191. * ——***Madonna, Child, and Four Saints.*** A large picture in the chapel on the first floor, where it shows to good advantage, placed over an altar. It is a bit restless in drapery and somewhat disturbed in composition by the sense of compression from the arch on top. It lacks a feeling of room or space, but there is a fine figure of St. Sebastian and a noble Madonna and Child. The children on the step are also very good. The colour is rich, varied, harmonious. An excellent Bordone.

51. **Borgognone, Il (Ambrogio Fossano).** ***Madonna and Child.*** A very charming, if somewhat sweet, Madonna. The flesh is lead-coloured—more so than is usual with the Milanese—and the drapery is a little sharp in its foldings after Borgognone's usual mannerism. The colour is good and the decorative effect is enhanced by the use of gold in the throne and on the floor. The Child is a little wooden, but the fat putti at the sides are fine in green and gold and have good sentiment. An early example.

52. * ——***Madonna, Child, and Two Saints.*** A larger and better example of Borgognone than No. 51. The flesh is less sooty, the drapery freer, the colour clearer. With handsome robes, flowers, and baldacchino. The suggestion of landscape back of St.

John is fine, and the little angels in the sky are delightful.

1647A. **Bosch, Jerome.** ***St. John in Patmos.*** A genuine enough Bosch, rather good in the figure of St. John and in the red robe, but the rest of the picture is a little crude. It gives an inadequate idea of Bosch and, besides, has been hurt by retouching.

78. **Botticelli, Sandro.** ***Portrait of a Young Man.*** Sombre in colour, but what character it has! Notice the drawing of the mouth and the eyes. It is hard but very effective. The attribution is questioned, but the picture is not far from Botticelli. It was formerly attributed to Filippino and afterward to Raffaellino del Garbo.

106A. ——***Portrait of a Young Woman.*** Lacking in colour quality, but a firm face, a noble Florentine type. It may be a genuine Botticelli, though it looks a little like a copy. Compare it with No. 78, and you will notice its poorer quality.

106B. ——***Portrait of Giuliano de' Medici.*** It has been repainted and does not now show distinct traces of Botticelli's work, but it was possibly by his hand originally, though a little mechanical in drawing. It now looks like a copy. Another version in the Bergamo Gallery.

106. ——***Madonna, Child, and Two Saints.*** This is probably by Botticelli's own hand, but it seems done in a perfunctory manner. It lacks inspiration and fine feeling. For the sensitive Botticelli, it is dull, prosaic. The drapery of the Madonna is formal and liny, the flowers in the vases are solid, the architecture is given without much feeling for shadow relief. Even the arabesque of leaves and

flowers at the back is laboured in the doing and has neither great love nor great skill about it. The whole work possibly represents the painter in a tired or careless mood. The foliage over the St. John at the left is about the only spirited part of the picture, and that is a little fussy in treatment. This is by no means Botticelli at his best.

102. ——***Madonna, Child, and Angels.*** It is weaker, more formal, less free in the drawing of the figures and accessories than No. 106. Compare it with that picture—the relief-work pattern on the two thrones, the flowers, the robes, the hands, the feet. The difference appears slight, and this picture has all the earmarks of Botticelli, whereby the Morelli followers should be able to say who painted it; but it has not the Botticelli quality. Moreover, it is duller and deader in spirit than No. 106 or even No. 102A, which is saying much. The catalogue suggests that it was done with the help of assistants.

102A. ——***Madonna, Child, and Singing Angels.*** Notice the bad drawing of the right eye of the Madonna and the false value of the whole side of her face—something that may have come from poor restoration in the cleaning room. But notice also that her hands and wrists are badly drawn, the Child's legs quite unbelievable, and the Child's head not on his body—things that are chargeable directly to the painter. Again, this picture has the Botticelli crooked forefinger, the square, black-rimmed nail, the foot with the long second toe and square nail; also it has the types and pseudo-sentiment of Botticelli, but it lacks his style, his distinction, his individuality, his quality. It is tame, prosaic, dull

as ditch water, but with some good colour in the robes and some pretty gold work in the borders. Probably a school piece by the same hand that did No. 1289 in the Uffizi at Florence, also attributed to Botticelli.

1124. ——*Venus.* There is some indication of its being a study for the Uffizi Venus, but this is slight and leads to no conclusion. The Venus at the Uffizi is not up to the Botticelli standard, technically, and is no better, perhaps not so good, in drawing as this Berlin example. This latter seems too well done for a varied copy. Notice the outlines of the arms, legs, waist, the curved lines of the jaw and face. The hair (touched with gold) is different from the Uffizi picture and the feet seem less pulpy. A very good picture whether a study or a copy. How very graceful in spite of its apparent awkwardness! And what an odd conception this Christian Venus! See the note on the Uffizi Venus (No. 39).

1128. * ——*St. Sebastian.* As the catalogue points out this is an early Botticelli under the influence of Antonio Pollajuolo and Verrocchio, and a very good example at that. It is worth some study for its fine outline drawing alone. The figures in the background are sketchy but full of life. And the colour of it, just as it is—the relation of the figure to the background, with the white cloth against the grey-white sky—is excellent. The Venus (No. 1124) might be tested by comparison with this fine nude.

81. **Botticelli, School of.** ***Portrait of a Woman.*** A bit pretty, but not wanting in charm whether school piece, copy, or imitation.

533. ** **Bouts, Thierri (or Dirk).** ***Elijah in the Wilderness.*** The colour qualities of the robes are superb, the landscape fine, the drawing rather minute and precise. Notice the second Elijah walking up the path in the background and how well this figure keeps its place in the landscape. Notice also the delightful colour of the angel's wings. And behold the blue shadows on the white dress—something the modern impressionists would have us believe they discovered! Part of an altar-piece (with 539) from the church of St. Peter at Louvain. Other parts are in the Munich Gallery (Nos. 110 and 111). An excellent panel.

533A. * ——***Christ in the House of Simon.*** If one were in a captious mood he might find fault because the table and the floor do not lie down flat and the still-life on the table is not effectively distributed; but the figures are so fine in feeling and the colour is so beautiful that minor matters appear inconsequential. What wonderful heads and what wonderful texture painting! A copy, probably by Albert Bouts, is in the Brussels Gallery (No. 626), which see.

533B. ——***Christ on the Cross.*** A cold landscape is in the background. The figures are formal but pathetic, the colour not so fine as that of No. 533. It is some sort of copy after a painter nearer to Roger van der Weyden than Bouts. See No. 543 and the catalogue note upon it.

539. * ——***Feast of the Passover.*** The robes are a harmony of all colours—red, blue, yellow, green, brown—held together by keeping them in the same key of light. The drapery is angular, the room well drawn, the light at left through the door excellent.

These panels by Bouts have no large simplicity of form in a Velasquez sense and no breadth of colour in a Titian sense; but in feeling, in sentiment, in refined and delicate workmanship they are almost above criticism. Part of an altar-piece with No. 533, but not so well done as the parts at Munich (Nos. 110 and 111).

545B. ——***Madonna in Adoration.*** Evidently a fragment of a Birth of Christ with a beautiful little landscape at the back. The Madonna is lovely in colour; but is it the Bouts colour, or type? There are many versions of this Madonna under many names. Some master hand, perhaps, created it, and many followers have repeated it.

545C. ——***Madonna and Child.*** It is rather crude for the painter of No. 533 but comes somewhere near him. It is in his style, but coarser in the hair and flesh, with less quality in the colour, and less invention in the landscape. The type of the Madonna with the "bumpy" forehead appears also in the Van der Weyden (No. 549A) and the Memling (No. 528B), both hanging near by. The type and its attribution are much confused in the European galleries. There are many versions of it under many names.

597A. **Breu, Georg.** ***Madonna and Child.*** It is worth looking at for its figures and landscape. These early German painters, such as Breu, Cranach, Altdorfer, are not seen elsewhere in the galleries of Europe so well as here, at Dresden, and at Munich.

338B. **Bronzino, Angelo.** ***Portrait of Eleanor of Toledo.*** A well-known portrait, sad of face, smooth of surface, and handsomely done in the dress and the pearls, but like all Bronzino's work, it is want-

ing in the decisive touch that lends distinction. There are other versions elsewhere.

853A. **Brouwer, Adriaen.** ***The Toilet.*** Look at it for a good bit of free painting by one of the most masterful of all the Dutch brushmen.

853H. ——***Shepherd on Road.*** A broadly painted picture of much excellence. An unusual Brouwer with some poetry in the silver-toned landscape. The figure is a mere colour spot. See also No. 853B and 853J for moonlight effects.

S21. **Bruyn, Barthel.** ***Portrait of a Lady.*** It is gay in the colour of under-vest and belt. A very sincere work and no doubt an exact likeness of the lady, but it is not inspired. With a good green ground.

S20. ——***Portrait of a Young Man.*** Companion piece to No. S21 and done in the same spirit. Both of them painted in 1534. Bruyn may be studied to advantage in the Cologne Museum.

588. ——***Portrait of John van Ryht.*** The colours of the robe are brilliant and attractive. The face and beard now look fumbled as though much gone over in the cleaning room. The hand also suggests cleaning-room processes.

283. **Bugiardini, Giuliano.** ***Madonna Adoring Child with Saints.*** A large and somewhat heavy group of figures loosely put together and indifferently drawn. The picture is not an inspiration even though the pretty little angel (without legs) descend from the heavens above.

569 } **Burgkmair, Hans.** ***St. Ulrich and St. Barbara.***
572 } Two panels with single figures that are odd and rather awkward but very good in colour. Burgk-

mair's best pictures are in the galleries at Munich, Nuremberg, and Augsburg; but these panels have strength in the drawing and colouring and are suggestive of power even in the landscapes. See also No. 584 for its good landscape.

414B. **Cano, Alonzo.** ***St. Agnes.*** This is dry in the handling and rigid in the drawing, but there is character about it. An attractive personality in the model and shown with good colour. Notice the large eyes and the distance they are apart, with the resultant look of wonder.

875A. **Cappelle, Jan van der.** ***Sea Piece.*** A painter about whom little is known more than that he painted marines fine in tone and light and with a silvery colouring. This is not the best example of him although a good enough picture in itself. It is a little hard in handling.

185. **Cariani, Giovanni Busi.** ***Young Woman in Landscape.*** Poor Cariani! Any picture that is too bad for a first or second rate Venetian is hung around Cariani's neck. He possibly painted this coarse picture, but, if so, did he also paint the refined, sensitive St. Sebastian in the Vienna Gallery (No. 63) and the rather lofty Madonna and Child in the National Gallery at London (No. 2495)? What a versatile soul Cariani must have been according to the connoisseurs! The picture was formerly a Giorgione, then a Morto da Feltre, and now merely a Cariani! It has been much repainted.

188. ——***Portrait of a Man.*** This portrait is more suggestive of the Giorgione (No. 12A) in the next room than any picture in the gallery. Notice the hair, the eyes, the brows, the ledge in front and the right hand upon it for a few obvious resem-

blances to No. 12A. But this, while now much injured, never could have been the equal of the Giorgione in either colour or spirit. It is far below it though later work. The head and body now do not hold together well. Compare this portrait with the heads, No. 12, put down to Giovanni Bellini's School but probably by Cariani.

14. **Carpaccio, Vittore.** ***Madonna and Saints.*** The Madonna is somewhat heavy in the jaw and none too religious in feeling, but what a charming Magdalen at the right and what beautiful robes she wears! With a true-enough Carpaccio landscape though the figures are not very characteristic of the master. It is probably a school piece or workshop picture.

23. * ——***Consecration of St. Stephen.*** The colouring is fine, the robes are beautiful in hue and pattern, the architecture good, the landscape full of interesting people, horses, houses, trees. The very pronounced sincerity of Carpaccio always lends interest to his pictures. Notice the frank faces of the kneeling figures and the little boy. It is not the best Carpaccio extant, but it seems the best of the St. Stephen series of which there are examples in the Louvre and the Brera.

23A. ——***Burial of Christ.*** This picture comes nearer, perhaps, to being an imitation of Basaiti than a Carpaccio. Compare it with the pseudo-Basaiti, No. 4, and also the Bellini, No. 1177A (really a Basaiti), for resemblances in the heads of Christ and also in trees and landscapes. Carpaccio was chiefly remarkable for the character of his men and the naïve quality of his women and children, for splendid robes, rich colour, and magnificent

architecture. Where are they here? And where is Carpaccio's charm or spirit or frank, half-boyish point of view? The small Carpaccio likenesses in this picture at the right, in the background figures and horses, are rather superficial. The picture has little of his peculiar quality about it. The figure of Christ lies flat and still, and as spots of colour some of the other figures are interesting; but the composition is scattered and shows too many spotty distractions (peculiar to Basaiti) for the eye to be well pleased with it. Compare the sky, rock forms, trees, water, figures with those in No. 23 and No. 14. The picture is falsely signed "Andreas Mantinea" and is probably by an imitator of Basaiti and Carpaccio. A similar picture in style and method, with a similar signature, is in the Metropolitan Museum, New York, under the name of Carpaccio (No. C22).

407. **Carreño de Miranda, Don Juan.** ***Portrait of Charles II of Spain.*** It is in Carreño's style, with a restless background and over-done accessories that oppress the small boy. This picture was probably elaborated from the Madrid portrait (No. 642)—the elaboration producing the dreadful curtains and the eagles above the picture-frames.

47A. **Castagno, Andrea.** ***Assumption of the Madonna.*** The red of it is startling, and a little primitive, perhaps, but attractive. The two figures at the side stand well and have well-drawn robes, and the brilliant angels with the variegated wings and garments are charming.

S8. **Catena, Vicenzo.** ***Portrait of Young Woman.*** It is almost a study in whites, to which result vigorous processes of cleaning have no doubt contributed.

The bust and neck are very flat, with their modelling lost, but the gold in the hair and the gold of the robe are still beautiful. The portrait lacks in force but has some charm. Attributed by some critics to Jacopo de' Barbari.

19. ——***Madonna, Child, and Four Saints.*** Somewhat too smooth and pretty, with a want of quality in the colour as of character in the faces. It is all on the surface, like powder and rouge, with no substance beneath it. It is a genuine Catena, as is also the portrait No. 32, but both pictures are weak, flat, unprofitable.

529A. * **Christus, Petrus.** ***Altar-Piece.*** A double picture with the Birth of Christ below and the Annunciation above. They must be regarded as two pictures though done by the same hand. The drawing and handling are here looser than with the average Van Eyck follower, the draperies are freer in their flow and fall, the colour is in larger masses, the composition simpler and more restful. It reminds one of the Deposition of the Brussels Gallery (No. 139), put down to a younger Bouts, and there is a consensus of opinion among critics that the Brussels Deposition is by Christus, but, unfortunately, there is little more than conjecture about Christus as the painter of either picture. He is practically an unknown quantity, and there are few attributions to him that may not be questioned. The colour here is as fine in depth and quality as a Bouts, the jewel work elaborate, the landscape excellent. The heads are odd in construction—notice that of Joseph.

529B. ——***Last Judgment.*** A more restless and uneasy composition than No. 529A and not so good in

colour. The angel in armour is beautiful in texture painting. There is a good study of the sea at the back. This is a repetition of a picture in the Hermitage put down to Jan van Eyck. Both the types and the technique associate it with the painter of No. 529A. It is a companion piece to that panel.

532. * ——*Portrait of a Young Girl.* It looks too mature and broad in method for a painter of the Christus date. The face and bust have been rubbed, and the eyes are a little odd in their drawing, but the picture is still fine in colour and quaint in characterisation. Notice the push back of the wall from the head. It has background, air, and light. Decidedly a fine portrait. There is a French look about it that keeps asserting itself.

523B. ——*Madonna, Child, and Donor.* A very pretty little picture, good in sentiment, with fine figures in richly coloured robes and a delightful townscape at the back. Formerly attributed to Jan van Eyck with a query. See the catalogue note upon it.

529E } ——*St. John Baptist and St. Catherine.* The
529F } wings of an altar-piece that are, perhaps, nearer to Geertgen tot Sint Jans than to Christus. They are large in their conception and broad in the landscape.

2. * **Cima, Giovanni Battista.** ***Madonna and Child with Four Saints.*** Somewhat like the Cima in the Louvre (No. 1209) but not so fine in colour. A late piece, a pyramidal composition with a beautiful throne, architecture, and mosaic work. The shadows of the flesh are a little sooty, the reds raspberry-hued, the draperies papery; but, never-

theless, it is a fine Cima. What a good suggestion of sky! Hurt by cleaning and restoration.

7. ——***Madonna, Child, and Donor.*** An early work. The Madonna's nose and eyebrows are a little hard but her head-dress is fine. The Child is the centre of light and interest, but the donor with the praying hands is perhaps the best bit of painting in the picture, though a little hurt. The landscape and sky are excellent as are also the colour and light.

15. * ——***Healing of Anianus.*** With beautiful Venetian architecture at the back and a group in Oriental costumes in the foreground. Rich in early Venetian colour. Done more freely than is usual with Cima, which suggests that it belongs to his later time. It is a handsome piece of work.

17. ——***Madonna and Child.*** The best part of this picture is the landscape, and even that is not very good. The figures have been damaged by restorations and the whole picture has been over-cleaned.

985A. **Claez, Pieter.** ***Still-Life.*** An attractive still-life to those who like the microscopic and the ultra-realistic. You could pick up the olive on the dish, which is conclusive evidence of high art to some people. The picture is good in colour and, of course, contains much skilful work, but one wonders if it was worth while.

448B. * **Claude Lorraine.** ***Italian Coast Scene.*** Unusually warm in colour for Claude, with bright figures in the foreground and a sunset sea at the back. The figures are said to have been done by Filippo Lauri. One seldom sees so good a Claude. It is an excellent picture.

578. **Cleve, Juste van der Beke van (Master of the Death of the Virgin).** ***Adoration of Magi.*** A triptych with saints on either side. The saint at the right is naïve and attractive. The central figures are rich in robes. The landscape is crowded with small details suggestive of Herri met de Bles, Patinir, and several other painters of their time. The work is said to be early and is not the master's best effort.

615. ——***Portrait of a Young Man.*** Done with much colour effect which does not detract from the portrait in any way. It is well drawn and forceful. Said to be a late work of the master.

633B. **Cleve the Younger, Juste van.** ***Portrait of a Lady.*** A substantial portrait full of good feeling if not wonderful workmanship. Once attributed to Holbein and now, just as doubtfully, to Cleve the Younger, called the Fool, about whom no one has much knowledge. See also No. 633A, of which Rubens is supposed to have made a copy, now in the Munich Gallery (No. 786).

406B. **Coello, Alonzo Sanchez.** ***Portrait of Philip II of Spain.*** Much hurt by repainting and originally perhaps too glittering in the costume, but a fair enough sample of Coello's work. He was a pupil of Moro.

55. **Conti, Bernardino de'.** ***Portrait of a Cardinal.*** It has a cut-out-of-wood look and is rather crude in workmanship, though no doubt a likeness and done without the least attempt to flatter. It is a signed work—something rare in the case of Bernardino's pictures.

1643. * **Corneille de Lyon.** ***Diana of Poitiers.*** This is a perfect little portrait after the style usually asso-

ciated with the Clouets. Look at it closely for the beautiful yet sure way in which everything about it is done. Observe the little note of colour in the bonnet. Formerly known as a Clouet.

607. * **Cornelisz van Oostsanen (or Van Amsterdam), Jacob.** ***Altar-Piece.*** A triptych of the Madonna and Child, with saints and donors in the wings. Coarse drawing is seen in the Madonna's hands, which may be compared with the Lucas van Leyden, No. 574A. The background, though full of small details, is well held together. Notice the donors with their fine heads and the saints standing above them in their rich robes. It bears no marked resemblance to other pictures attributed to this painter. The landscape and the Madonna seem Netherlandish, but the Child and the little angels are of Germanic origin. In any event, the work shows good colour and has a character of its own.

218. **Correggio, Antonio Allegri da.** ***Leda and the Swan.*** A graceful but not very strong performance. The figures of the attendants are charmingly disposed and support on either side the central figure of Leda. The faces are insipid and the colour is rather frail, but it is not just to hold Correggio responsible for this. The picture has been very badly injured. The head of Leda was at one time cut out of the picture and afterward replaced and restored by Charles Coypel. Later (1830) a new head was painted and inserted. The circle of the original cut can still be seen in the canvas. The attendant figures have also been repainted. See the catalogue note upon it.

115A. * **Cossa, Francesco del.** ***Autumn.*** A large, strong figure, rather coarsely drawn and unusual in colour.

There is, apparently, some Paduan influence in the sculpturesque drapery and in the perspective, as one looks down upon the half-Mantegnesque landscape. The figure is more real than ideal, even though used in allegory. Notice the realism of the grapes. The picture is much repainted but still a good example of a rare man.

112. **Costa, Lorenzo.** ***Christ in the Temple.*** Notice the arch of figures in the first plane and its repetition in the figures of the second plane. But in spite of this attempt to bring the figures together the characters are not related to one another. Each one stands apart and poses for himself. But the picture is simple and restful with good colour.

115. ——***Deposition.*** Large in size and lacking force because of the scattered composition. The figures do not hold together well, though there is an oval or circular arrangement to them. Somewhat stained in the flesh-notes. The landscape is the best part of the picture with its distance of sea and mountains.

559A. **Cranach the Elder, Lucas.** ***Madonna and Child.*** A type somewhat Teutonic and heavy but full of sincerity. The children are very charming in their infantile quality. But Cranach does not improve by enlargement of the panel.

564. ——***Apollo and Diana.*** With an attractive outline drawing, now somewhat hurt by repainting, as in the Apollo, for instance. Of course, it is the Germanic classic that we have in the types. And why not? The deer and landscape seem uninjured.

618. ——***Portrait of a Young Patrician.*** It is simply and easily done. Notice the doing of the eyebrows,

moustache, mouth, nose. An effective portrait, surely.

567. ——***Adam and Eve.*** A motive often employed by Cranach and designed to show his picturesque outline drawing. This example shows to better advantage than No. 564, because in better condition. Notice the fruit and foliage and the strong colour of the sky. See also the large nudes, Nos. 594 and 1190.

567A. ——***St. Anne and the Madonna.*** These are attractive figures in their types and robes. A wonderful green curtain is back of them. At the top are charming little putti. Notice the landscape at the side.

564A. * ——***Rest in Egypt.*** A very beautiful picture in every way. The Madonna, children, and angels all have great charm and sweetness of mood. The colour and grouping are excellent, the landscape is masterful. Those who cannot overlook or forget the Germanic types in a sacred subject and can see nothing admirable in these figures might look at the landscape. Shut out the figures with your hand or your hat and look at the trees in their relation to the distant sky. Where did you ever see in art a more beautiful colour harmony? The blue is equal to Chinese porcelain in quality. Probably a very early work and certainly a very lovely one.

593. ——***The Fountain of Youth.*** This picture will please because of its amusing subject, but it is not so good a work as the pictures Nos. 564 and 567, for instances. It is, of course, not in the same class with No. 564A. It was probably designed by Cranach and painted by pupils.

567B. ——*David and Bathsheba.* A Germanic way of telling the familiar story with the nude carefully omitted. It is not wanting in good colour. What naïve figures! And how well related to their background!

589. ——*Cardinal Albrecht of Brandenburg.* The colour of the Cardinal's robe is a bit high in key. The landscape is good. Better as a portrait than No. 559—in fact, one of Cranach's best.

100. **Credi, Lorenzo di.** *Madonna Adoring Child.* A fair example of Lorenzo. The flesh, as usual, is white and dough-like, the colour cold, the background hard and formal. It is a bit trite in sentiment.

103. * ——*St. Mary of Egypt.* An exceptionally good Lorenzo. The figure is well drawn, and the angel coming out of the sky is excellent. Much better than No. 100. See the note upon it in the catalogue.

Cristus. See Christus.

1156A. **Crivelli, Carlo.** *Madonna, Child, and Seven Saints.* It is a very ornate picture with much jewelling and brilliancy of colour in the robes, fruits, architecture; yet with all its fine workmanship and beautiful colour, the picture fails in producing a pleasant impression as a whole. Possibly this is due to the confusion of patterns in the brocades, the mass of rich things, and the wealth of jewelling. The picture is barbaric in its richness. Then, too, the angle lines formed by the architecture, the staffs, and the drapery are uncomfortably apparent. And, again, the Madonna seems too small in the head. It is a good piece of work but over-crowded with

detail, too angular in its lines, and a little out of proportion as regards its figures. Crivelli is a wonderful painter at his best. His decorative effects are as fine as any in Italian art.

1156. ——***The Magdalen.*** Not so rich in gold or patterns as No. 1156A and simpler in effect, filling the panel well. The gilded stucco reliefs, the robe, the flowers, the marbles are excellent. Notice the pale roses at the top and then the bright coral beads about the neck. It is not, however, a superlative example of Crivelli.

861. **Cuyp, Aelbert.** ***Landscape.*** A yellow sunlight effect, very easily, even sketchily, painted and with good colour. Several other Cuyps are in this gallery, but, saving No. 861B with its fine luminous sky, they are not remarkable.

1064. **Daddi, Bernardo.** ***Coronation of the Madonna.*** Notice the faces of the saints and angels, also the kneeling and standing angels in the central panel. They are very pure in sentiment.

1064A. ——***Madonna and Saints.*** A larger piece than No. 1064 but, perhaps, not so good decoratively. This may be due to some restoration.

527. **Daret, Jacques.** ***Adoration of Kings.*** The one-time tendency to identify Daret as the Master of Flémalle is not carried out in the attributions here at Berlin. The painters are regarded as distinct personalities. The Darets seem a little coarser, more commonplace in workmanship and prosaic in sentiment than No. 538C by the Master of Flémalle. The identity of the Master of Flémalle has not yet been completely established, though he is now generally considered one and the same person as Robert Campin.

573. **David, Gerard.** ***Crucifixion.*** It lacks in quality and there is nothing very distinguished about its colour or its drawing. A somewhat perfunctory and uninspired panel. The kneeling figure is the best part of it, although the group at the right is fairly well given. The background has the look of a copy, and the figures rather add confirmation to this.

573A. ——***Madonna and Child.*** It is explained (in the catalogue and elsewhere) that this is an early David, which may be true. It is certainly not a characteristic one, as we now understand this painter. The subject is about all that relates it to his other work. The Holy Family at the right is picturesque.

1614. * **Domenico Veneziano.** ***Portrait of a Young Woman.*** The face, neck, and figure are now flat in modelling—probably the direct result of overcleaning. It is a fine profile, a noble portrait. The face is not pretty but is full of dignity and character —the strong Italian type of the early Renaissance, than which Europe has never seen anything finer. The attribution is not satisfactory, nor is Mr. Berenson's tentative assignment to Baldovinetti wholly acceptable. The painter of it was near to the painter of the Portrait of a Young Woman in the Poldi-Pezzoli Collection (No. 157), Milan. Moreover, these two portraits are not far removed from the two portraits (Nos. 585 and 758) in the National Gallery, London, but the resemblance between this Berlin picture and the one at Milan is the stronger. They should be compared for the drawing of the nose, mouth, eye, neck, hair, and the brocaded pattern. Who did them is still a question. The blue background has been repainted and now fits

too closely about the head, neck, and figure. It has no depth nor any recession.

847. **Dou, Gerard.** ***Rembrandt's Mother.*** In Dou's Rembrandtesque style, like Nos. 257 and 258 at Cassel. The identification of the sitter as Rembrandt's mother is merely a flight of the imagination. We know nothing whatever about her personal appearance.

557D. **Dürer, Albrecht.** ***Portrait of Jacob Muffel.*** The face looks as though it had met with some severe repainting. The modelling is still large and powerful. The drawing originally was, no doubt, very good. Formerly thought to be a copy.

557E. * ——***Portrait of Jerome Holzschürer.*** The fineness of lines suggest the engraver. It is a remarkable piece of work, although it has not much breadth. Dürer was a realist of detail, and is, perhaps, more famed for fineness of brush stroke than ensemble or breadth. See also the Portrait of Frederick the Wise by Dürer (No. 557C). They are none of them satisfactory in their present conditions.

557F. ——***Madonna of the Finch.*** The brown shadows of the flesh are a little disturbing. They may be due to some dark underbasing working through to the surface, but it is more likely that they are directly due to bad repainting. The colour is somewhat violent. The cherubim at the top are hurt. The landscape at the right is very good.

557G. * ——***Portrait of a Young Woman.*** It foreshadows Hans Holbein in its outline drawing and is worth a score of Dürer's Madonnas such as No. 557F. It is something seen in the life rather than in the

imagination. A brown-skinned young woman and different from Dürer's usual portraiture. Probably done at Venice, with some Italian influence apparent in it. Notice the suggestive background and the poetic feeling conveyed by it. Hurt by repainting. The chain now refuses to travel about the neck, and the outline is a little hard. The painter's initials are worked into the embroidery of the neck yoke.

770. **Dyck, Anthony van.** ***The Mocking of Christ.*** * A good Van Dyck in the manner of Rubens but a little hot in the flesh of the chief figure, as may be noted by comparison with the St. Sebastian of Rubens next to it. The colour, however, is unusually clear and good for Van Dyck, and the drawing is true. The light is dull and the shadows dark. Another version at the Prado, Madrid (No. 1474).

778. ——***The Dead Christ.*** The figure of Christ shows the influence of Rubens in the drawing and modelling. The shadows are black from underbasing and the flesh-notes are hectic. The colour is dusky and uncertain because of the changes it has undergone. These are not the pictures in which Van Dyck succeeds. In his religious pictures he almost always betrays mental and technical weaknesses. He was a portrait-painter above all else.

782. ——***Portrait of Thomas François di Carignan.*** There is much flourish of trumpets and display about it, but the results are rather barren. There is too much pose, too much lace and armour and not enough of the straightforward man.

782A. ——***Nymphs Surprised by Satyrs.*** Well-drawn figures with good action and life. The flesh-notes are excellent. The work is not unlike Rubens and

was probably done under Rubens's influence. Notice the finely modelled back of the seated figure.

782B. * ——*Portrait of a Noble Genoese.* A fine portrait of an old man with ruff and cuffs, and a shrewd, judicial look in his eyes. In Van Dyck's so-called Genoese period, with an effective robe and architectural features. The face and hands are beautifully modelled, and the figure is well placed on the canvas. Everything about it is quite right except the surface, which is smoother than usual. That may be the result of cleaning. The colour is dull in grey-browns. That may be the result of some repainting or of Van Dyck's having tried to produce a Titianesque effect. It is a peculiar example of the painter. Where does one see its like? But a fine portrait.

782C. * ——*Portrait of a Genoese Lady.* This is the companion piece to No. 782B, but it is not so satisfactory as the former. Both are excellent so far as composition, drawing, character are concerned. Notice the manner in which the hair and eyes, the forehead and chin are given. The whole face is beautifully drawn. The hands are a little frail and too elegant—the right hand, perhaps, too much cleaned. Placed on the canvas to match No. 782B. As regards the face, it is apparently in better condition than its companion piece, No. 782B. But both portraits have dull, dark colour, which is odd for Van Dyck's Genoese period. The two pictures are perhaps Van Dyck's tribute to Titian, in which he helped himself to that master's blacks, whites, and half-tones.

787A. * ——*Portrait of Marchesa Geronima Spinola.* A young lady's exclamation over this portrait, "What

a pity she had to die!" is perhaps sentimental but nevertheless expressive. She meant to say the lady was too beautiful to die. But, since she had to die, how fortunate she was in having had Van Dyck to paint her portrait for future generations! A fine Van Dyck in his Genoese period, showing him in his swaggering, ornate style, with not too much good drawing but with an air of elegance and nobility. What grace and carriage in the figure with the full-falling skirt! What a pose of head! What a glance! How she moves forward and up! A splendid type of dignity and womanhood. Somewhat repainted in the face and cleaned in the hands, which have darkened from black underbasing. (Thiem Collection.)

799. ——*The Two St. Johns.* It is empty as a composition, and the architecture at the sides does not help it out much. The head of the Evangelist looking up is very fine, with a beautifully drawn face and well-painted hair suggestive of Van Dyck's master, Rubens. The Baptist is less satisfactory. The right hand is rather bad, and the legs are not convincing. In Van Dyck's early manner while under the influence of Rubens.

820. **Eeckhout, Gerbrandt van den.** *Christ Presented in the Temple.* A very good group well painted and fine in colour and atmosphere. In Eeckhout's smoother manner, but it may, nevertheless, be compared with No. 828J, put down to Rembrandt, but really by Eeckhout in a freer style of brush-work.

609. **Engelbrechtsen, Cornelis.** *Calling of Matthew.* What good grouping and good colour! The scene of the interior with its green table-cloth, figures,

still-life, light, shadow is excellent, though the drawing is not of the best. What colour in the green and red robes, the architecture, the cushion! It is a fine picture, though few people stop to look at it.

512 } **Eyck, Hubert and Jan van.** ***Six Wings of the***
523 } ***Ghent Altar-Piece.*** Of this famous altar-piece
*** the originals of the three central panels of God, the Madonna, and John, with the Adoration of the Lamb below, are in Ghent; the Adam and Eve panels are in Brussels. The rest of it, including the Playing and Singing Angels, the Just Judges, Christian Soldiers and Pilgrims, the Annunciation, and the Donors, is here in Berlin. Copies by Coxie of the central panels are in place here in the Berlin Gallery, so that a good idea of the effect of the whole work is obtainable.

Enough and to spare has been written about this celebrated altar-piece. There are many disputes about the authorship, and more than twenty different surmises have been made as to which brother painted this or that portion. The inscription on the wing at the left reads, in substance, that Hubert van Eyck "began" it and Jan "finished" it. Which did which? Without entering deeply into the merits of the question, it may be pointed out to the most casual observer that two hands have been at work here. Ignoring the Coxie copies of the central panels we take first the Singing and Playing Angels, and the two side pieces of the Christian Soldiers and Just Judges. The garments and draperies and brocades here fall full and free, without much crinkling or sharp angle lines. The painting seems broader, fuller, and comparatively freer than in the panels with the Donors or the

Annunciation, though this and the colour cannot be argued from with confidence, since the whole altar-piece has been restored a number of times. In the centre panel of the Adoration (Coxie's copy) there is some crinkling in the drapery of the kneeling figures in front, but this is by no means so marked as in the white figures in the wings or in the Madonna and the Annunciation angel. It is more like the crinkling and angularity which the Donors have in their garments.

Consider the wing with the Donors. Notice the difference between the draperies of the Donors and those of the figures in white—St. John the Evangelist and St. John Baptist. The latter are sharply folded, the hands and fingers squarer, the hair in pronounced ringlets to give a sculpturesque effect. The shadows also are not so dark back of the white figures as back of the Donors. Consider next the Madonna on the opposite wing. The flesh is much paler (which may be the restorer's hand) than in the Donors or the Singing and Playing Angels, the white drapery is abrupt in angle lines as in the two Johns, the drawing is again sharper than in the Singing Angels or the Judges or Riders. Moreover, the type, as well as that of the angel Gabriel, is different from the Singing Angels. And is not the sentiment or feeling of this Angel and Madonna more intense or, at any rate, different from that of the Singing Angels?

It may be fairly inferred, and it is probable at least, that the inscription is true, and that two men worked at the altar-piece—the two brothers. Again, which did which? If Hubert "began" it, is it to be supposed that he began on the outside wings first? In a Rubens-workshop sense, to "begin"

was to sketch in or outline or base; to "finish" was to put the final surface touches upon it. But Hubert could not have "finished" in that sense, because he died years before the altar-piece was completed. It is likely that he "began" with the central panel of the Father, Madonna, and John, with the Adoration, that he did the Just Judges, the Soldiers, the Singing and Playing Angels, and possibly the Donors. These being the freer and broader portions of the altar-piece, it has been inferred that Hubert was the broader and freer painter of the two—the better painter. But how could that be when Hubert was the earlier and older painter, and there being every reason to suppose that Jan, coming twenty years after and a pupil of Hubert, would have developed a more mature and freer technique than his brother? The problem is difficult of solution, and this is not the place to attempt it by arbitrary assignment of the different parts to Hubert or Jan. It is sufficient to recognise two hands in the altar-piece, one drawing more freely than the other. Which was Hubert and which Jan is not likely to be known with any certainty.

Let us now look at the altar-piece a moment merely as a series of pictures, regardless of its origin or of its painters. All the panels have been restored and retouched.

512. ——*The Just Judges.* With portraits of Hubert van Eyck (the rider in blue robes in front) and Jan van Eyck (in black, turning to look to the left). All the riders are contemporary portraits of distinguished people. (See the Revue Archéologique, November, 1910.) How magnificently they are clothed and how superbly they ride! What won-

derful horses and what a background landscape! This is the Flemish ideal or point of view, but compare this group of horsemen with the Italian ideal of Benozzo Gozzoli, in the Riccardi Palace in Florence, where the Medici are riding in the Adoration of the Magi, and it will not suffer. A wonderful piece of early Flemish painting, than which nothing finer has been produced.

513. ——***The Christian Soldiers.*** These are the advance-guard of the Just Judges and are a part of the procession. They are quite as magnificent in horses, costumes, and strong characterisation as the Just Judges. Notice the landscape at the back of these two panels. They are perfect in their way. There can be no carping or cavilling over such work as this. The only thing the critic can do is to hold his tongue and rejoice that some art is beyond him.

514. ——***The Singing Angels.*** Here again is the Flemish ideal, but with what sincerity and honesty it is realised! Did the religious feeling of Filippino or Botticelli ever go beyond it? Notice the splendour of the brocades, the bordering bands, the jewels. And what wonderful exactness and precision without losing strength of characterisation or truth of ensemble!

515. ——***The Playing Angels.*** More angels, more brocades and jewels, more beauty of colour and delicacy of workmanship. Notice the beautiful robe of the seated angel in the foreground. And, again, how well this minute work holds together! It does not prevent a large simplicity of forms.

516 } ——***The Hermits and the Pilgrims.*** With fine
517 } heads and free-falling robes and a forest of trees with fruit. What serious-looking faces! What

naturalistic forms and movements! What moving, animated throngs! The large figure is the giant St. Christopher.

519 } ——***Portrait of Jodocus Vydt and Wife.*** Homely
522 } but honest folk, painted with a sincerity that can never be too much praised. What exquisitely drawn heads and hands! The drapery is a little restless at the bottom, but that is a small matter. The flesh colour is reddish, possibly from retouching. The woman seems the better in colour as in forceful characterisation. It is difficult to say whether the painter of the broad drapery (supposed to be Hubert) or the painter of the angular drapery (supposed to be Jan) did these Donors.

520. ——***The Angel of the Annunciation.*** The type is less robust and more pathetic than in the Singing and Playing Angels. It is a different type. The flesh colour of the hands and face is paler, the hair lighter and more tender in the painting, the drapery more angular. A very beautiful angel. The panels between the Angel and the Madonna are copies—the originals being at Brussels. This Angel panel is supposed to have been painted by Jan.

521. ——***The Madonna of the Annunciation.*** The hands are very frail and small as compared with the Singing and Playing Angels. The flesh colour is like that of the Annunciation Angel. The robe is sharply folded in wrinkles. The type and sentiment are different from those of the Singing and Playing Angels. Supposed to be by Jan.

518 } ——***The Two Johns.*** They are in grisaille, rep-
523 } resented as statuary, and are between the two

Donors. They are the least-interesting portion of the altar-piece. They are supposed to be by Jan.

523A. **Eyck, Jan van.** ***Portrait of Giovanni Arnolfini.*** * This is a supreme effort in characterisation and also in colour. It is excellent. Notice the hands. Cleaned a little too much, perhaps, but still very fine. There are people who doubt its authenticity. One wonders why.

525A. ——***Man with a Pink.*** It is very exact, miniature-like work. The wonder is that this exactness did not result in something trivial like the work of Dou or Mieris. Notice the hands and the pink and also the fur hat. The face is less interesting. Are these the Jan van Eyck hands? Compare them with the Madonna and Angel in the altar-piece, Nos. 520–521. The picture has been shaken somewhat by modern criticism and is now vaguely said to be a good replica of a lost original.

525C. ——***Madonna and Child in Church.*** A good picture in colour and in the church background. The drapery of the Madonna falls freer than in the large altar-piece in the next room, and the drawing is less rigorous. It is another version of the picture in the Antwerp Gallery (No. 255) and not an entirely convincing Van Eyck.

525F. ——***Christ on the Cross.*** It may be questioned if it is by either of the Van Eycks. The drawing is hardly of Van Eyck accuracy, and the sentiment is excessive. It is probably school work, and possibly by the same hand that did the two altar-wings at the Hermitage (No. 44). A landscape with snow mountains at the back. Somewhat injured.

525G. ——*Portrait of a Knight of the Golden Fleece.*
* A miniature-like performance, beautiful in detail and not wanting in carrying force. The hands and the dress with its patterns do not look like the work of the Van Eycks, but the picture is quite worthy of them or of any other early Flemish painter. Fine in colour and beautiful in the drawing of the face, the pattern of the coat.

1175. **Ferrarese School.** *An Espousal.* This picture
* has the true spirit of art if not the power of effective technique. The drawing is all bad, the landscape is crude, the painting immature, but what an indescribable feeling for dignity of presence and beauty of colour! With all its faults, an attractive picture. Attribution decidedly uncertain. It might be Paduan or Veronese work.

1147. **Ferrari, Defendente.** *Adoration of the Child.* Notice the odd putti with coloured wings and the excellent Donor at the right. The picture has good quality. An early example of the painter and with some morbidity or excess of sentiment. The architecture suggests in its arches that the picture should have a rounded, not a square, top.

380B. **Feti, Domenico.** *Elijah in the Wilderness.* Not without some sure and free painting in the angel's wings. Good also in colour. See a similar subject in the Madrid Gallery (No. 629) by Alonzo Cano.

129. **Fiorenzo di Lorenzo.** *Madonna and Child.* A bright piece of gilding and colouring that makes everything near it look dull and tame. Such an old master is just as killing among its neighbours in a gallery as a Claude Monet among modern landscapes of the Corot type.

Flemish School. See Netherland School.

813B. **Flinck, Govert.** ***Susanna.*** A finely illuminated back, better in lighting than in drawing, but a beautiful piece of modelling, nevertheless. There is much artistic feeling about it. At The Hague (No. 707) they put down this sort of thing to Rembrandt with no questions about it. Here at Berlin they ascribe it to Flinck with a query.

47. **Fogolino, Marcello.** ***Madonna Enthroned with Saints.*** A large altar-piece with a balanced composition, fine robes, and good architecture. The Madonna in her niche is queenly if not pietistic. An excellent landscape. The picture shows some North Italian influence, possibly coming from Vicenza, or even Brescia.

1133. **Foppa, Vincenzo.** ***Pietà.*** The flesh-notes are stained and brown, possibly as the result of old restoration. It is hurt but still possesses a charm of colour. Notice the bright reds and oranges. The hands and feet are badly drawn and much repainted.

1617. **Foucquet, Jean.** ***Etienne Chevalier and St. Stephen.*** These are fine, strong faces and figures, not unlike Holbeins in some respects. They are now somewhat injured. Notice the St. Stephen at the right with his thin, spiritual face. The left half of a diptych; the other part is in the Antwerp Gallery (No. 132).

Francesco di Stefano. See Pesellino.

122. **Francia, Francesco.** ***Madonna and Child in Glory.*** A large but not very satisfactory picture. The figures are too hot in colour and the landscape is too cold. There is no marked unity between the

figures and the landscape, but an attempt is made to unite the upper and lower groups by the lines of St. Catherine's wheel which are repeated in the Madonna's aureole. The draperies of the two central figures seem damaged by restoration.

287. **Francia, Giacomo.** ***Madonna as Queen of Heaven.*** It is in the improvised chapel down-stairs. A large picture and important, but cold in the blues and unhappy in the attitude of the figures below. They stand badly. Nor does the Madonna above stand any better. A fine landscape at back.

245A. **Franciabigio (Francesco Bigi).** ***Portrait of Young Man.*** The portrait is red in the eyelids and lips, mannered in the hands, and rather attractive in the Andrea del Sarto landscape with its blue-green sky. It is a portrait with some individuality about it and some nervous, sensitive quality. Sir Claude Phillips gives reasons for thinking it by Il Rosso in the Burlington Magazine for December, 1911.

1079. **Gaddi, Taddeo.** ***Madonna and Child.*** It still has fine decorative quality about it in its gilding, its tooling, and its colouring. See also No. 1081.

90. **Garbo, Raffaelino del.** ***Madonna, Child, and Two Angels.*** A little uneasy in the draperies, the trees, the landscape, but interesting in sentiment. The parapet at the back breaks across the circle abruptly. A characteristic and graceful work of the master, showing the influence of Filippino.

98. * ——***Madonna and Child Enthroned with Two Saints.*** This seems to be the most important picture given to Raffaelino in this gallery. It is a very good work, restful in colour and drawing and

good in sentiment. Notice the angels with lilies at the back for sentiment that is, perhaps, a little strained. The carpet on the steps is irritating in its newness and bright colouring. A handsome frame with small pictures in the panels probably by a later hand.

S1. ——***Madonna, Child, and Two Angels.*** It has Filippino's sentiment somewhat drawn out and attenuated. A little frail in the form of the Madonna (who does not stand well), in the angels, in the cushion on the bench, in the architecture. Injured by repainting in parts.

243. **Garofalo (Benvenuto Tisi).** ***St. Jerome.*** An excellent example of Garofalo. Here the painter is at his best, especially in the landscape, which has some distinction and individuality about it. The robes of the saint lend a bright key-note of colour.

213. * **Gaudenzio Ferrari.** ***Annunciation.*** A beautiful picture, unique in its reds and greens and charming in the types. The angel and the lilies are lovely. And what beautiful golden hair! Well drawn and free in its handling for the man and the time.

1631. **Geertgen tot Sint Jans (Gerard of Haarlem).** ***John the Baptist.*** The drawing is sharp and the landscape somewhat mannered, especially in the foliage, but the total effect of the figure belonging in and to the landscape is very good. It has not the breadth of the Louvre picture (No. 2563A) nor its colour. And the forlorn attitude of the Baptist with his hard little lamb beside him is not inspiring. It is the same figure, however, that appears in Geertgen's work elsewhere.

806D. **Gelder, Aert de.** ***Family Scene.*** Very animated and sketchy handling but without good drawing in it or under it. It is ineffective facility. Notice how badly constructed are the heads and hands. The colour is fine.

21. **Ghirlandajo, Domenico.** ***Judith.*** There is some good movement in the figure at the left, but Judith herself is posing too much. The relief on the wall and the pilasters are very good. Not strongly representative of Ghirlandajo. It is probably a school piece. It was once attributed to Mantegna—an impossible assignment.

12A. ** **Giorgione (Giorgio Barbarelli).** ***Portrait of a Young Man.*** A fine type of mid-Renaissance portraiture. It has the frankness and nobility of character seen in the early men with some of the technical excellence shown in the later men. A serene, well-poised mind, a refined and sensitive nature, a clean-cut, intellectual face are here shown. How calmly the eyes look out at us without an insolent stare but rather with a gentle, inquiring look! Surely an attractive personality. But is it by Giorgione? What other picture of his shows so much of the sensitive and the intellectual as this? Is it a picture of Giorgione's date or just before his time? Has it not something of the sharpness and flatness of the early Renaissance in the outlines of the face, the drawing of the eyelids, the hardness of the hair, the comparative slightness of the shadows, the thinness of the colouring? Is the hand on the ledge like the one in the Shepherd with a Pipe at Hampton Court, or is it a little hard and cramped like Giorgione's less learned contemporaries, say Catena? And what about the dress,

with its colours changed somewhat, its square checks in the sleeve at left, the angle lines and sharp breaks at the right. Is this early Renaissance drawing anywhere apparent in Giorgione's other work? The earliest Giorgiones, like the Castelfranco Madonna, are more mature. The same kind of a quilted sleeve appears in the early Titian Ariosto (No. 1944) in the National Gallery, London, but again how vastly more mature it is than this! There seems nearly a quarter of a century's difference between them. This Giorgione portrait has the look, the eye, the hair (faded on the ends, as in the Budapest Giorgione), the outline of a very early Sebastiano del Piombo, but probably it is by some earlier Venetian whose name even we have not heard. Gallery directors are often bothered by there not being enough familiar names in art to go around—to fit such unique examples. But let us not overlook the art in questioning the attribution. This portrait is a superb expression of rather early Venetian painting—quite good enough for Giorgione and, in spite of one's doubts, possibly by him. It certainly is Giorgionesque. This Berlin portrait with the Giorgione at Budapest, the repainted and questionable La Schiavona of the Crespi Collection, and the so-called Ariosto in the National Gallery, London, all seem to have something in common. Is it a common hand or a school likeness?

1074A. **Giotto di Bondone.** ***Crucifixion.*** It is not large enough in structure or drawing for Giotto. It is probably a school piece. The colour is attractive.

TUCSON ARIZONA

30. * **Girolamo dai Libri.** ***Madonna and Child Enthroned with Saints.*** There is here a decided show-

ing of Veronese methods in composition and colour, as witness the Madonna, the throne, and the handsome playing angels below. The picture is rich in deep, dark notes of colour.

26. **Girolamo da Santa Croce.** ***St. Sebastian.*** Hard in line, almost airless, and thin in colour. With a yellow-streaked sky—an oft-repeated effect of this painter.

1622A. **Goes, Hugo van der.** ***Adoration of Shepherds.*** It is reminiscent of the larger and more important Van der Goes in the Uffizi at Florence but by no means so attractive. The shepherds are here placed at the left. The composition is somewhat huddled, the drawing exact but forceful, the colour strangely beautiful. Notice the hands. And the brocades left and right. The form and size of the panel suggest that it was originally part of a predella.

551A. * **Gossart, Jan (Mabuse).** ***Christ on Mount of Olives.*** A moonlight effect very interesting for its study of night shadows and colours. The picture is strong in its pathos, its weirdness, its mystery of shadows. The drapery uneasy and the drawing hard but the colour is good. Notice the light on the angel's robe in the sky. Attribution questionable. It may be nearer to Bouts than Gossart.

648. ——***Neptune and Amphitrite.*** A good piece of drawing, showing Gossart's attempt at the Italian type, which suggests his having seen work of Michelangelo, of Jacopo de' Barbari, of Dürer. The figures are lumpy, large of hand and foot, narrow in the eyes. Northern flesh and flabbiness are still apparent in them. With severe Greek architecture at the back.

650. ——*Madonna and Child.* In Gossart's slippery, smooth style of work. It is restless—almost as much so as the portrait No. 586A, which is wholly lacking in repose. No. 656A, assigned to Hemessen, is also probably by Gossart.

865E. * **Goyen, Jan van.** *View of Nimeguen.* A fine diagonal composition with a white-clouded sky and excellent colour. It has a big lift about the sky. Interesting also for the buildings of the time. One of the best Van Goyens.

501E. **Guardi, Francesco.** *The Giudecca.* Of the three pictures here put down to Guardi, this is, perhaps, the most beautiful in colour if the most spotty in the small high lights. See also Nos. 501F and 501G. None of them is a superlative Guardi.

766. **Hals, Frans.** *Portrait of a Man.* A very positive piece of work, delightful in its free handling of the brush, which gives such a sense of power in the painter. Notice the fine forehead, the eyes, cheeks, and mouth. It is thoroughly well done in every way though little more than a miniature.

[800. ——*Portrait of a Man.* It is a questionable Hals and is not a very interesting portrait in either type or treatment. Even the hat, which is usually so attractively done in a Hals portrait, is here balloon-pointed and disturbing. The white collar is high-keyed, but well done, and the head, hair, and hands are accurate but nothing more. No. 801, a companion piece, is in the same style. They are both school or shop works.

801A. ——*Singing Boy.* A rather attractive boy, but the picture is to be accepted with reservations.

The feather, hair, and coat are cheaply done—such work as a pupil-copyist might do or an imitator such as Judith Leyster.

801c. ——***Hille Bobbe.*** In the late manner of Hals and very free, even sketchy, in its handling. It looks as though it might have been done at a single sitting. Examine it closely for the easy breadth of the brush strokes, and then move back from the picture and notice the certainty of almost every stroke, and the large truths of form it reveals. His hand at this time is still energetic and has nervous power, though now growing careless and at times ineffective. The slashes of paint in the sleeves revealing the high lights, as also on the ruff, the cap, the tankard, the owl, are not so absolute in their certainty as in his earlier work. What a revelation of a type! What bulk, body, and weight are here! What spirit and life!

801g. * ——***Nurse and Child.*** A very human piece of portraiture. The unconscious little smile of the child, the equally naïve and well-pleased smile of the nurse (or mother?) tell their own story. A little precise in drawing, perhaps, but not finical or fussy. Notice the sureness of the touch in the ruffs and head-dresses, the child's brocade, the hands, the faces. It has no great breadth of handling. How well the two figures are placed on the canvas without sacrificing one to the other! And yet, with all its excellences, it may be school or pupils' work and not by Hals. It seems to agree with the style of work in the Van Beresteyn portraits in the Louvre, the Laughing Cavalier in the Wallace Collection—pictures perhaps not by Hals.

801H. ——***Portrait of Tyman Oosdorp.*** There is not too much life in this portrait. The work is a little heavy. Hals did it carelessly or feebly, for it is a late portrait. The painter was an old man with a hand at this time that would not always obey his brain. The mouth, nose, and right eye are out of drawing, but the hands are suggested only, the white below the collar is inconclusive, the flesh is greyish, the shadows brownish, the hair is swept in with a broad brush and rather effectively. A fine sense of tone and the figure well set in are its notable excellences.

801F. ——***Portrait of a Haarlem Patrician.*** A very interesting portrait, lively in its feeling and very sure in its handling and drawing. It seems somehow to suggest Dirk Hals more than his brother Frans, but in either event it is well done. Compare it with the small portrait No. 766, which seems more in the style of Frans Hals. There is a difference between them.

825. **Heerschop, Hendrick.** ***King from the East.*** An intelligent and spirited piece of painting if not very accurate in drawing. In the Wallace Collection (No. 238) similar work is given to Rembrandt.

825A. **Helst, Bartholomeus van der.** ***Portrait of a Young Woman.*** Somewhat too peach-like in the flesh and a little exaggerated in the jewellery. Not Van der Helst's best effort. See also the note on No. 413A in this gallery—the Admiral Borro formerly assigned to Velasquez.

886. **Hobbema, Meindert.** ***Landscape.*** This example of Hobbema is no improvement on Ruisdael and lacks Hobbema's brighter colour and light.

Compare the drawing of the tree trunks and branches with the Van de Velde (No. 922c).

586. **Holbein the Younger, Hans.** ***Portrait of Georg Gisze.*** An ineffective portrait because of its scattered composition and its superabundance of small objects placed here and there with wearisome formality. Each detail is well enough done, as notice, for example, the vase and flowers; but the details do not hold together or help toward a united end—the revelation of the man. Compare this work with The Two Ambassadors (No. 1314) in the National Gallery, London, which is still more wearisome in its green ground, its planted figures, and the minutiæ of rubbish that grow up about them. It may be doubted if Holbein did either work—heresy though it be to say so. The Kratzer portrait in the Louvre (No. 2713) is of a piece with them.

586B. ——***Portrait of a Young Man.*** This portrait is similar in style and quality to Nos. 586c and 586D, and none of them are more than mediocre performances. This No. 586B is smooth, flat, rather hard, thin and crude in colour. No. 586c seems a little firmer in the drawing and more suave in method, but the change is slight. They are possibly school pieces or school copies.

586D. ——***Portrait of a Man.*** Said to be in Holbein's late English manner, when he grew somewhat hot in his flesh-notes. It is well enough drawn in the eyes and brows and has minute engraver-like lines in the beard, but is, all told, too smooth and lacks Holbein's force. There is an absence of quality characteristic of the copy. Look at the flatness of the figure, the thinness of the blacks, reds, and blues.

820B. * **Hooch, Pieter de.** ***The Mother.*** A picture in De Hooch's best style. The light coming in at the back is warm, penetrating, delightful. The painting of light finally became a mannerism with the painter, but not more so than with Corot. One does not tire of the light of either painter. The drawing and handling are simple and direct, and the colour is excellent. Notice the feeling of depth and space behind the bed curtains, and for texture painting look at the warming-pan on the wall and the still-life on the table. A fine De Hooch.

1401A. ——***Dutch Interior.*** It is not De Hooch at his best. It is easily, even sketchily, done but not too effective in light, drawing, or colour. Attribution doubtful.

1401B. ——***The Gold Weigher.*** A picture rather warm in colour from its wall background, though not so brilliant in light as is usual with De Hooch. The head does not join the figure well, and the latter, though large, is sack-like. But it is well painted, with good textures, some air and feeling for space, some effect of broken light. Attribution questionable. Some one of the school may have done it.

554. **Isenbrant, Adriaen.** ***Madonna and Child.*** It is probably by some follower of Gerard David, but it is worth insisting upon once more that Isenbrant is only a name. We know only that the man was a David follower, but have not a single authentic example of his work to judge by. David, Isenbrant, and Patinir are the names tacked on various versions of this Madonna and Child, seen in various European galleries.

S12. **Italian School (Upper).** ***Portrait of a Young Man.*** A rather strong head, given with some emphatic hardness in the face and the red coat, but done with honesty and candour. It is a little like an Antonello da Messina. (Simon Collection.)

S13. ——***Madonna and Child.*** It has good sentiment and feeling though somewhat coarse in line and muddy in colour. See the catalogue note for possible influences and origin. It was probably done by an early eclectic who helped himself to the work of painters at Florence and at the north. (Simon Collection.)

750B } **Keyser, Thomas de.** ***Father and Son and***
750C } ***Mother and Daughter.*** These portraits at one
* time probably formed the wings of an altar-piece. They are good pieces of portraiture and excellent in both colour and brush-work. The fine heads in No. 750B are almost worthy of Rembrandt. What types they are, what dignity and force they possess! When and where did De Keyser ever better them? Notice the fine painting of heads and gowns and also the fine sense of colour.

750. ——***Family Group.*** A formal family group, done simply and awkwardly, with no attempt at cunning or finesse in the composition. The heads are all well done. And notice the hands, how individual they are. They might have been painted by Van der Helst, so excellent are they. The catalogue gives the picture to De Keyser with a query.

821A. **Koninck, Philips.** ***Landscape.*** A huge expanse of country under a clouded sky, with long horizontal lines cutting across the canvas. A restful composition, though not perhaps a first-class Koninck.

596A. **Kulmbach, Hans von.** ***Adoration of the Magi.***
* How very well the figures are arranged in this picture! There is no crowding or huddling, but a very true and naturalistic grouping. And there is great sincerity of feeling about it. Look at the peasant type of the Madonna. She is really pathetic in her dumb, uncomprehending look. The drawing is good and the colour excellent. The landscape perhaps a little too cold. A fine picture and very well handled for the time of its painting.

90B. **Leonardo da Vinci.** ***Resurrection of Christ.*** The attribution to Leonardo has not been generally accepted. We have heard much of Leonardo's love of contours, his flowing lines of drapery, his delicate blending of light and shade, his masterful drawing; but where are they apparent in this work? Notice the bad foreshortening in the figure of Christ, the laboured flight of the figure, the harsh angle lines of the draperies in the kneeling saints at the right and left. Compare these contours and draperies with so weak a Leonardo follower as, say, Melzi (No. 222 in this gallery), and even in this inferior pupil you will notice greater freedom and grace. The much-discussed Leonardo wax bust in the next room has more rounded and perfect contours than appear in this picture. Besides, the tomb is badly drawn, the hands are hard, especially in the knuckles, and the landscape is too crudely blue-green. The picture is interesting but not great. It undoubtedly belongs to Leonardo's School. It has been somewhat injured.

574A. **Leyden, Lucas van.** ***The Chess Players.*** Coarse in the types and harsh in the drawing (notice the hands), but it has some power. What massive

heads and bodies! An early work, perhaps, though not very much like the work of Lucas van Leyden.

584B. * ——*Madonna and Child.* Odd in its vagaries of colour, as, for example, in the leaf-like wings of the small angels. The colour is not only unique but very attractive. The Madonna and Child are a little heavy in type, but are given with pathos and feeling. The arabesque at the back is very good, and the total effect brilliant, high-keyed in light and colour. It is firmly drawn and easily painted. A beautiful picture. There is a suggestion of influence from Dürer about it.

584A. ——*St. Jerome.* In the painter's usual vein of colour, which is very unusual compared with other painters. What a lovely harmony that of St. Jerome and his heliotrope robe! An effective little picture.

46A. **Liberale da Verona.** *St. Sebastian.* An important example of Liberale though very rigid and wooden-like. The drapery, leaves, grass are metallic, the columns are like bronze. But the hard drawing has a certain strength. The background figures above and below are pleasing spots of colour, and there is a glimpse of light through the arch.

78A. **Lippi, Filippino.** *Allegory of Music.* Small and rather coarse in the drawing of the chief figure. The cupids and swans are no better. The trees at left and the sea are the best part of the picture. It has a hint of Raffaelino del Garbo in it.

82. * ——*Madonna and Child.* A lovely, ill-drawn Madonna with a sad, inquiring look, and quite in the Filippino vein of sentiment and colour. The flowers

and landscape at the left are very attractive—perhaps the best feature of the picture—though a little too high in key for the figures. The picture also suggests Botticelli but is smoother in drawing, softer in outline, and with rounder contours. Mr. Berenson gives it to Amico di Sandro, which is to say that it belongs to the painter who did No. 1412 in the National Gallery, London, and No. 52 at Budapest. The flowers, draperies, landscapes are all of a piece in these pictures, and they were almost certainly done by the one hand. That hand was not Filippino's.

96. ——***Christ on the Cross.*** The figures are touching in sentiment but pallid in colour and rendered ineffective by the high key of the gold ground. The angels are attractive and have a fine swing about them. Somewhat injured.

96A. ——***Portrait Head.*** Done in fresco on plaster and now put in a frame. Interesting for the method and the medium which can here be studied close at hand.

101. ——***Madonna and Child.*** Rather attractive if a little superficial in sentiment. It seems done in a mechanical manner and is very uneasy in the draperies.

58. **Lippi, Fra Filippo.** ***Madonna and Child.*** It still has good sentiment and colour, though hurt by repainting.

69. ** ——***Madonna Adoring Child.*** A very fine Fra Filippo both in feeling and as decoration. The influence of Fra Angelico shows in the Madonna type, in the colouring, in the lovely flowers in the foreground. The heavy type of the Child, peculiar to

this painter, is repeated in the St. John. The drapery is a little regular in its foldings under the Madonna's knees. The landscape shows the problem of lighting (under the shadow of trees) in process of development. There is also here (before Leonardo's time) some knowledge of the stratification of rocks. And notice the dark brook at the right. The picture represents the Trinity as well as the Madonna Adoring the Child. A very pure picture not only in sentiment but in technique.

95. ——***Madonna as Mother of Mercy.*** There is the same feeling here as in No. 69, but it is, perhaps, less intense, less pure. The Madonna's red robe is beautiful in colour. Some of the work in this picture may have been done by pupils. The figures at the side are not very well done. Injured by repainting.

1700. ——***Portrait of a Woman.*** A much-repainted portrait. It is Fra Filippo only in a vague way though a true enough Florentine picture. The colour is forbidding, and the type is neither very forceful in character nor graceful in features. The same painter did a double portrait with a Florentine coat of arms upon it in the Metropolitan Museum, New York (No. 256). The Berlin portrait is a recent acquisition.

1081A. **Lippo Memmi.** ***Madonna and Child.*** Good in colour as also in the gold ground with its tooled borders and haloes so rich in ornamental design. It is too much varnished. See also No. 1067.

1077. **Lorenzetti, Pietro.** ***St. Humilitas Healing a Sick Nun.*** Interesting Sienese work by a leader in the early school. There is largeness in the forms and great simplicity in the robes and architecture.

Notice the figure and action of the saint. It is work akin to Giotto's in its breadth. See also No. 1077A, by the same painter. Both belong to an altar-piece in the Florence Academy (No. 133).

153. **Lotto, Lorenzo.** ***Portrait of Architect.*** It belongs to Lotto's middle period and is not his best endeavour by any means. It has some of the large but superficial quality of, say, a Franciabigio, though a franker effort than Franciabigio was capable of. With very positive hands. The background repainted.

182. ——***Portrait.*** The Lotto spirit here has rather overcome the personality of the sitter. But the spirit is very attractive, as always with Lotto. With his work it is eminently the painter rather than the painted—the individual view and expression rather than the object seen.

320. ——***Portrait.*** This portrait has the same quality as No. 182 but is possibly more interesting. It is a study for the painter as well as the psychologist, for it has some large seeing and doing about it. The curtain is raised at the right to give a glimpse of the sea. Somewhat injured about the head and its background.

323. * ——***St. Sebastian and St. Christopher.*** A beautiful white-skinned Sebastian, reminding one slightly of Correggio, with the sensitive spirit of Lotto revealed in the partly shadowed face and the writhing, twisting body. A remarkable sea below. The companion piece, St. Christopher, is apparently a dark-skinned, strong-bodied contrast to the St. Sebastian, suggesting a following of Titian. The child is Lottesque and charming. Another study of the open sea is here seen below.

325. * ——***Christ Leaving His Mother.*** With Lotto's usual intensity of feeling in the principal characters —perhaps this time a little too intense. What a beautiful type that golden-haired saint back of the Madonna! And what a columned hall with its light-and-shade and the garden at the back! It is very remarkable architecture. The figures are loosely held together. Notice the figure with the book at right. Somewhat hurt.

819c. * **Maes, Nicolas.** ***Woman Peeling Apples.*** More attractive at first blush than on further acquaintance, though it is a very good Maes. The style of it, originally derived from Rembrandt, became stereotyped and mannered in the hands of Maes. He painted the same effect and the same model again and again, finally painting the model after she was dead, with a similar burst of light falling on her face in his picture at Brussels (No. 617), there ascribed to the Dutch School.

83. **Mainardi, Bastiano.** ***Portrait of a Young Woman.*** The portraiture of the still-life is perhaps better than that of the young woman. The companion piece to this, No. 86, is not more inspiring but perhaps more doubtful in its attribution.

85. ——***Portrait of a Cardinal.*** A somewhat matter-of-fact and shallow performance with something of the weakness and softness of No. 86.

9. * **Mantegna, Andrea.** ***Portrait of Cardinal Messarota.*** One of the splendid types of the Renaissance, full of power and dignity, a churchman, perhaps, but also a warrior type. It is done in a firm, positive manner, quite in keeping with the type of the sitter, and no doubt reveals perfectly

in its rigid drawing the character of the man. Notice the strength of colour in the red faintly repeated in the face and under the white dress. A fine portrait.

29. ——***Presentation of Christ in the Temple.*** The drawing is sharp, the hands such as the Bellini frequently painted, the colour now dull but harmonious. The Madonna has a frightened look, the Child is crying, the others look on unconcerned. The whole picture has suffered from repainting. Compare for this the hair and the drawing of the eyes and mouth with those of the portrait No. 9. This may account for the dull, lifeless quality of the colour. The Madonna's dress and the priest's robe are attractive in pattern.

27. ——***Madonna and Child.*** It is possibly an early work by Mantegna, though doubted by some. The sentiment and colour are both good, the haloes are rich and, with the fruit, make an ornate panel. The drawing is as sharp as a Crivelli. The putti of the outside framing are very charming in both sentiment and drawing. An excellent picture, no matter who its author.

S5. ——***Madonna and Child.*** As the catalogue suggests, it shows the influence of Donatello. It is somewhat repainted, which accounts for some monotony of colour. The drawing is still good and the space well filled. Notice how the drapery carries on the line of the neck. Simon Collection.

210A. **Marco d'Oggiono.** ***St. Sebastian.*** The figure is clumsy, the angel impossible, the landscape done out of the painter's head from memory of Leonardo's landscapes. Not a picture of any marked merit.

1645. **Marmion, Simon.** ***Life of St. Bertin—Altar Wings.***
* The left wing contains superb French architecture wonderfully done not only in drawing but in colour and light. The sculptures in the niches, the pattern under the roof or over the door at the left are excellent in relief and design. The drawing of the figures is not over-exact in either heads, hands, or robes, but the characterisation is sufficient. The sentiment is quite right. The colour is clear and beautiful, as see, for instance, the colour of the robe and shield at left or in the group at right. The interior scene of the birth at the left is excellent. Notice the fine castle in the landscape.

1645A. ——***Life of St. Bertin—Right Wing.*** Com-
* panion piece to No. 1645. Done in the same vein and spirit as the preceding number and with much invention and imagination. What a fine effect looking through into the cloister, with its frescoed Dance of Death upon the walls! The robes and architecture, as in No. 1645, are all beautifully done. Marmion is only a name in French miniature painting, and this altar-piece (part of it is in the National Gallery, London) is the only large work attributed to him that has even a possibility of authenticity about it. It is not by any means certain that Marmion did it, but whoever its author it is without doubt a beautiful example of the early border art of France and Flanders. Its like is not seen elsewhere.

58A } **Masaccio, Tomasso.** ***Adoration of Kings.***
58B } These panels are probably genuine enough, but they are slight work and give one a very limited idea of Masaccio, who is not to be seen adequately outside the walls of the Carmine, at Florence.

575 } **Master of Frankfort.** ***Altar-Piece.*** These panels
575A } have a rather coarse grit in their workmanship
575B } but their total effect as decoration is considerable. One does not feel this so much in the central panel, with its formal arrangement of objects, as in the panel at the left (No. 575A). Here the figures in their brocades, crowns, caps, and emblems are very good. How well they carry themselves! How gracefully their robes fall from the hips down! The white figures of No. 575B have, perhaps, more refinement of feeling than the others.

Massys, Quentin. See Metsys.

Master of the Death of the Virgin. See Cleve, Juste van.

538A. **Master of Flémalle.** ***Christ on the Cross.*** The figure is frail and attenuated, the draperies angular, the drawing rather harsh in outline. The picture is restless but very tragic in its expression of grief. In colour it is high in key and somewhat scattered—the sky at the top and the blue at the bottom being, perhaps, out of tone through repainting. But the tragedy of it is compelling. The Master of Flémalle was galvanised into life by several art critics about 1898. Wauters would identify him with Hubert van Eyck and others with Jacques Daret, but the present tendency is to identify him with Robert Campin. He was at first called the Master of Merode. The personality is still something of a puzzle and the works of several painters have been attributed to the name.

1704. **Master of St. Aegidius.** ***St. Jerome.*** The figure and robe are finely done as also the foliage and landscape. Notice the pattern of leaves and flowers about the Cross.

810A. **Meer of Haarlem, Jan van der.** ***Landscape.*** A view of Holland with a high sky full of clouds and a strong, dark foreground. The colour effect is very good. A picture that is Rembrandtesque in its foreground.

54 } **Melozzo da Forli.** ***Astronomy and Dialectics.***
54A } Somewhat formal compositions. Two companion pieces are in the National Gallery, London (Nos. 755 and 756). They are too heavy for Melozzo, the man who did the angels (parts of frescoes) in the sacristy of St. Peter's at Rome. Modern criticism gives these works to Justus of Ghent.

222. **Melzi, Francesco.** ***Pomona and Vertumnus.*** The figure at the left shows an imitation of Leonardo's contours and draperies very gracefully rendered—perhaps too gracefully. The face is merely sweet. A pretty picture, with the exception of the figure at the right, which is dull and heavy. The landscape is spiritless.

528B. **Memling, Hans.** ***Madonna and Child.*** It is possibly by Memling but seems to lack in quality. Doubtless the centre portion of an altar-piece the wings of which are in the Uffizi at Florence. The wings suggest a following of David. This is not a wholly satisfactory piece. See the catalogue note.

529. ——***Madonna and Child Enthroned.*** In Memling's style and showing his types. The landscape is a little formal but decorative. The motive and subject are frequently repeated. These Madonnas with bumpy foreheads are sometimes given to Bouts, to Van der Weyden, to Van der Goes in the European galleries. They are all probably versions or copies of the work of some one man as yet unidentified.

529c. ——***Portrait of an Old Man.*** The face has been flattened by cleaning but still has force in it. A companion piece to a recently acquired Portrait of an Old Woman in the Louvre. Early work and possessed of truth and virility. The blacks in connection with the flesh colour are well handled.

529d. ——***Madonna and Child Enthroned.*** It is Memling's type of Madonna and Child, also his background; but the picture has no quality in drawing or colour. It might be a school piece or an old copy. There are many versions of it. Somewhat cleaned and repainted.

792c. **Metsu, Gabriel.** ***The Sick Woman.*** The whites are perhaps too high but the sick figure is well drawn and painted, as also the grief-stricken one at the side. A good picture by Metsu who, at his best, was almost in the Terborch class.

561. **Metsys, Quentin.** ***Madonna and Child Enthroned.*** The Madonna, the Child, and the robes are done smoothly, and there is a Luinesque sweetness in the types. Notice the slightness of the arm and hand. The head-gear, throne, and landscape still suggest the early Flemish method of working in detail. There is effective painting of the glass and bread. And a very pretty rose garden at the right. The colour is bright but very satisfactory. The catalogue calls it a school copy of a picture in St. Jacques, Antwerp. Another version at Amsterdam (No. 1529).

574c. ——***The Magdalen.*** A fine bit of colour and very well painted. It has some North Italian, Milanese feeling about it almost indescribable. A detail, perhaps, of a larger picture of the Deposition, which has been cut out and framed up in its present form.

A similar face in the Deposition by Metsys, at Antwerp. This picture may be a version of it.

960B. * **Molyn, Pieter.** ***Evening.*** A work of the very best quality in landscape. Notice the rare colour in the sky. And yet all that the world has ever done for this painter has been to take his best pictures away from him and give them to Rembrandt, or Vermeer of Haarlem, or some one with a gallery reputation. The inferior Molyns are still under the name of Molyns.

44. **Montagna, Bartolommeo.** ***Madonna Enthroned with Saints.*** Somewhat austere and cold with a Paduan or Veronese influence apparent in the Madonna. Notice the diminutive figure of St. Catherine with her wheel at the bottom. Injured.

44B. ——***Christ between Saints.*** A dark picture, very mannered in the drawing of drapery and types but very true in feeling and spirit. The Magdalen kneeling at the back and the attitude of the Christ are remarkable. The composition is odd, as though the picture were designed for a triptych. It has colour quality and much strength of drawing. To be studied in connection with No. 46C, by Bonsignori—a kindred spirit.

197. * **Moretto da Brescia (Alessandro Bonvicino).** ***Madonna and St. Elizabeth in Glory.*** A double composition or two pictures on one canvas, held together slightly by the little angel with the scroll. A beautiful altar-piece in its fine types, the dignity and loftiness of the general conception, and its silvery tone of colour. Notice the wonderful old bishop at the left with his superbly drawn robes. Moretto was not one of the great gods of art, but still a man of much force and ability. And with

a fine colour sense. The relation of the flesh-notes to the white robes and the robes to the pale silver of the sky is noteworthy.

193. **Moroni, Giovanni Battista.** ***Portrait of a Man.*** The sitter apparently has struck a supercilious air and attitude. A very good portrait, however, and far from being commonplace. At one time thought to be a likeness of the painter. A little injured.

193A. * ——***Portrait of a Scholar.*** With red hair, red flesh, red hands, and black clothes on a dark grey ground. A fine portrait and one of Moroni's best efforts. What a look and pose and character! How well it is drawn in the mouth, chin, and hands! It is a work of sterling quality without being inspired.

167. ——***Portrait of a Young Man.*** This portrait has not the interest of either No. 193 or No. 193A. It is a little dull and monotonous in colour.

414. **Murillo, Bartolomé Estéban.** ***St. Francis and the Christ Child.*** Sentimental and consequently popular but not so good a work as No. 414C. It is messy in the painting and frail in the lighting, though striving for a forceful, Ribera-like effect.

414C. ——***Adoration of Shepherds.*** An unusually good Murillo. The Madonna inclines to prettiness, but the shepherds, especially the kneeling one, are rather fine. The colour is very acceptable for Murillo.

526A. **Netherland School.** ***Deposition.*** A picture set down to no celebrated master and yet just as beautiful in sentiment, in pathos, in colour, in all the features that go to make up fine painting, as other panels of loftier birth and pedigree. The

subject, the drawing of the Christ, the St. John at the left, all point toward Roger van der Weyden's studio. The picture probably came out of that studio.

630c. ——***Decapitation of John the Baptist.*** This picture belongs, with the pseudo-Bles picture at Munich (No. 146), to a painter confused with Bles or maybe Bles himself in decadence. See the note on the Munich picture (No. 146). This is a good picture and perhaps up to the average panel attributed to Bles.

630b. * ——***Christ and the Holy Women.*** A picture of both passion and power. There is not only depth but strength in the light, shadow, and colour. The contours of faces and figures are smooth but the figures and their action are forceful. What beautiful colour in the robes at the left! One can only guess at its painter.

538b. **Netherland School, 15th Century.** ***Death of the Madonna.*** An effective grouping of both forms and colours in a believable interior. Its author is difficult to locate. A similar picture is in the Prague Gallery. Van der Goes possibly painted both panels.

Oggiono. See Marco d'Oggiono.

845d. **Ostade, Isaac van.** ***A Peasant.*** This is a picture that should be studied as a piece of large drawing and free handling quite worthy of Adriaen van Ostade or even Brouwer. There is nothing petty about it. Notice how it holds at a distance and reveals the body, bulk, and substance of the figure.

532a. ** **Ouwater, Aelbert van.** ***Raising of Lazarus.*** A balanced composition with Lazarus in the centre

and an architectural ground at the back. The drawing is exact, especially in the feet and hands, after the Flemish manner of the Van Eycks. The draperies are liny and break into angles at the floor, the brocades are superb, and the patterns upon them are wrought with goldsmith-like precision. Look at the robes and Jewish head-dresses at the right and the coloured head-gear seen through the grated door at the back. What a splendour of colour and how well the truth of it is preserved under light and under shadow! And what excellent architecture! A fine picture with a sincere spirit. Notice the sentiment, the feeling of the kneeling figure at the left. There is little or nothing known about the painter or his work, so the assertion of the catalogue that this is "the only authentic painting by him" holds true for the present time. He is said to have been a pupil of the Van Eycks. The relation between Ouwater and Bouts—he was supposed to have influenced Bouts —seems obvious, or at least their pictures have a likeness to one another in types and colour.

1144. **Padua, School of.** ***Bewailing the Christ.*** This picture is to be compared with Nos. 1170A and 1678. All three pictures had a common origin at Padua or Venice and are illustrations of the sincere if exaggerated way in which the passion and death of Christ were depicted by the northern painters of the Vivarini-Bellini-Squarcione Schools. This No. 1144 is of about the same time as the others, and has their depth of colour and tragic quality.

31. **Palma, Vecchio.** ***Madonna and Child.*** Much repainted, and, in spite of the signature, it seems too slight in quality for Palma. It may be a very

early work but it has the bloodless look of a Catena. Compare its reds, whites, and flesh colour with the undoubtedly genuine Palma, No. 197B. In any event it is of no great importance.

174. ——***Portrait of a Young Man.*** A Palmesque figure, but whether by Palma or not is not so certain. Crowe and Cavalcaselle thought it genuine. The head is rather badly placed on the neck and the hands seem things apart from the body. It has been much cleaned and the hands, face, and neck repainted in parts.

183. ——***Holy Family.*** Whoever painted it, the work itself is not vitally important as art. It is not certainly a Palma for all the large, blond character of the Madonna. The landscape, however, is similar to his work.

197A. ——***Half-Length of a Young Woman.*** This is too much repainted to tell what was its original look. It has the appearance, the type, the general air of a Palma, but compare it with No. 197B and there will be considerable difference noticeable in the whites, reds, and flesh-notes. It has the signed initials "R. L."

197B. ** ——***Half-Length of a Young Woman.*** A superb Palma! A little over-cleaned, but what a splendid type of beauty! And what drawing and colour! Try the quality of the whites, reds, and flesh-notes with the other attributed Palmas in this gallery, and what a difference! This is the genuine "large, blond type," not the imitation, and has body and substance to it with beautiful lines and most graceful contours. A fine picture. Never mind about the young woman's type or superfluous flesh. Look at the line, light, and colour of it.

1129A. **Palmezzano, Marco.** ***Christ Standing before the Cross.*** Very picturesque in the four little figures in the landscape at the back. The Christ is somewhat weak in type and pretty in colour. Palmezzano was not at any time a very strong painter though he had a sense of the pictorial and the decorative.

131. ——***Nativity.*** Those who have studied Marco Palmezzano at the Brera, Milan, and elsewhere will, perhaps, view this picture with some surprise. It is a rocky, knotty-looking affair, but it is much better held together than is usual with this painter's work. And it is better in colour and sentiment. The drawing is hard and the landscape airless, but it is, nevertheless, an imposing Palmezzano.

113. **Panetti, Domenico.** ***Lamenting the Dead Christ.*** A large, Costa-like landscape with a lake in the centre in which St. Christopher is walking. The foreground figures are subdued in colour and there has been an evident attempt to harmonise them with the landscape—make them fit in it. It is an interesting picture by a painter little known outside of Ferrara. He was the master of Garofalo.

608. **Patinir, Joachim.** ***Rest in Flight into Egypt.*** The Madonna and Child, with the basket and bags, are rightly placed in the landscape and are beautiful in colour, but the foreground and background of the landscape do not marry—do not blend together. The blue-green is false in value. The foreground, with its figures and houses, is in perfect keeping with the Madonna and Child, but not the background. A similar picture at Antwerp (No. 47) is put down as a copy after Gerard David. Better works of Patinir are seen at the Prado,

Madrid (Nos. 1613, 1614, 1615). Sometimes work of this subject and character is given to Isenbrant —a pupil of David about whose work we know nothing.

1166. **Pennacchi, Pier Maria.** ***Entombment.*** A pathetic picture, rather pretty and not powerful, but given with good feeling. The little angels are naïve creations both in sentiment and colour.

49. ——***Madonna, Child, and Saints.*** The drawing of the nose is hard and all the eyes pop out of the faces. The Child is pretty and quite conscious of it. Even the Madonna is somehow posing for her picture. But taken as colour alone the picture is effective. It has been recently promoted from the "Venetian School" to Pennacchi, for reasons given in the catalogue note.

1651. **Pesellino, Francesco.** ***Crucifixion.*** Only a little scrap of a picture, but full of colour charm and fine feeling. What beautiful colours upon gold! And what a beautiful filling of the pyramidal space!

107. * **Piero di Cosimo.** ***Venus, Mars, and Love.*** A little wooden and stiff in the joints but captivating in its almost boyish attempt at presenting a Greek idyl. Giorgione and Titian did this sort of a thing much better, more maturely and completely, but Piero, who was always a little erratic, is naïve in his awkwardness and attractive, perhaps, because of his halting lines and colours. Notice how the arm of Mars is sharply repeated in the angle of armour. The white veiling and linen of Venus with the happy little Love and the rabbit are interesting studies in whites, and the pieces of the armour good studies in textures. Notice also the

painting of flowers, trees, and grass in the landscape with the little cupids and the sea at the back. Also the doves and rabbits.

204. ——***Adoration of Shepherds.*** A late work and more mature than No. 107. The figures and drapery are sharp-edged in their drawing, but there is good movement. The peasant types back of Joseph might have been inspired by Van der Goes (never by Cosimo Roselli or Leonardo), so realistic are they. What a charming figure that of the Madonna! What a fine sky and landscape! Notice the tranquil indifference of the generously proportioned ox lying along the edge of a quarry at the back and the waiting donkey above him.

132A. **Pinturicchio, Bernardino.** ***A Reliquary. Sts. Augustine, Benedict, and Bernard.*** It is done in water-colour and is crude in the drawing and rather careless in the handling. Notice the doing of the clouds and the hands. Perhaps an early work with the painter bothered by the medium.

143. ——***Madonna and Child.*** Not great either in thought or execution but very charming in its sentiment and graceful colour. It is possibly not by Pinturicchio but is near him and of the Umbrian School. Venturi thinks it by Antonio da Viterbo.

259B. * **Piombo, Sebastiano del.** ***Portrait of a Young Roman Woman.*** A portrait sometimes known as "Dorothea," done in the Roman manner of the painter but Giorgionesque in spirit. The picture (long thought to be a Raphael) shows the same model as the so-called Fornarina of the Uffizi (No. 1123), also once put down to Raphael. They are both from the hand of Sebastiano, together with

the picture in San Giobbe, Venice, in which this same model again appears. The figure is a little soft in line for Sebastiano, and academic in its hands. Shown in a Roman contadina dress. The landscape at the left interesting. The picture somewhat repainted.

95A. **Pisanello (Vittorio or Antonio Pisano).** ***Adoration of Kings.*** What a decorative circle it is! It would look well even if hung upside down, so rich is it in colour. And how attractive it is in its romantic people, with their fine, picturesque garments in that mediæval valley, with its story of a birth in the foreground, and its suggestion of death by hanging in the background! What a story could be woven out of this group in the valley! But the painter has made the picture solely for its looks—made it out of costumes, horses, rude strong heads, castles, sea, and sky. A decorative piece almost primitive in methods, rather summarily executed, not well drawn, and by no means the last word in Italian painting. The landscape is better than the figures. The picture has been variously attributed and does not speak positively for Pisanello. The types, the drawing, the landscape are hardly his. It is probably by some one near him, though Venturi thinks it of the School of Paolo Uccello.

73A. * **Pollajuolo, Antonio.** ***David.*** A delightful little picture! And a masterpiece in its individuality, its line drawing, and its fine colour. It is somewhat awkward in the Donatello St. George attitude, with that naïve awkwardness that belongs to all the early Renaissance men. A romantic, even a dandified, David. Done about the same time as

the Apollo and Daphne in the National Gallery, London (No. 928), and in the same poetic vein, yet based upon substantial truth and accurate Florentine drawing.

73. * **Pollajuolo, Piero.** ***The Annunciation.*** The picture is confusing at first because of the insistent architecture and because the panel is cut in two by the central architectural partition. The angel in the corridor is one picture; the Madonna at the right is another picture. The painter, as it were, pulled out some of the architecture to make a unity of the halves and with not too good a result. But, on examination of the parts, this proves an absorbing work. The Renaissance architecture is superb; the room, with its door and window looking out on the landscape, its panelled walls and marble floor and beautiful bed, is magnificent. As for the figures, the gorgeously robed and jewelled angel with the message is full of pathos and the ill-drawn Madonna, tall and stately, is meekly receptive. Notice the wealth and the harmony of the colour and, once more, the beauty of the architectural patterns, the windows and doors at left, the charming little landscape, the wonderful floor. The figures and draperies are not very accurate in their drawing. The picture is uneven in execution as though more than one hand had been working upon it, which was probably the case. But its general effect is very fine.

832A. **Porcellis, Jan.** ***Marine.*** A beautiful little sea piece with attractive colour. This painter's works are not frequently seen in public galleries.

872A. **Potter, Paulus.** ***Landscape.*** As usual with Potter, we have acrid green foliage, hard cattle,

and cast-iron dogs. The petty niggling of the leaves and the dryness of the handling are notable. And still Potter is regarded as a wonder in Dutch painting—a wonder among the Dutch, the most accomplished of all the painter craftsmen!

39. **Previtali, Andrea.** ***Madonna, Child, and Saints.*** It is superficial in every way—something done for sale, perhaps, more than for love of art. No. 45 by Previtali is no improvement on No. 39, being pretty in the types and the treatment. The catalogue regards the painter as identical with Cordelle Agii. See the National Gallery note on Previtali.

141. **Raphael Sanzio.** ***Madonna and Child (The Solly Madonna).*** All the Raphaels in this gallery are early works and show Raphael in his rather pretty Peruginesque manner. They do not represent the painter adequately, though they are gracefully composed, with smooth surfaces and flowing lines, and even as early works show some individuality. This Solly Madonna was done under Perugino's direct influence. A comparison with No. 147 hanging near it will demonstrate that this No. 141 is better drawn in the face of the Madonna, the body of the Child, and in the hands and the feet. The type of face is rounder, the colour lighter, the painting freer, as notice the plumage of the bird. Notice also the drawing of the trees and the foliage. The hair is rather flat.

145. ——***Madonna, Child, and Two Saints (The Madonna of St. Jerome.)*** This was done a little later, perhaps, than No. 141, and is not so well done as No. 247A. Notice the drawing (and slight repainting) of the fingers. The painting of the hair of the saints is not very different from that of No.

141. It is apparently a less accurate work, though this is rendered somewhat uncertain by the fact that it is not, perhaps, so free from retouching.

147. ——***Madonna, Child, and St. John.*** It is nice in sentiment and very Peruginesque in workmanship. The colour is deep in reds and blues. The hands and fingers a little repainted. It is not precisely Raphaelesque. As the catalogue suggests, it belongs somewhere near the Perugino workshop. Known as the Madonna della Casa Diotalevi.

247A. * ——***Madonna, Child, and St. John (The Madonna Terra Nuova).*** Done by the young Raphael, probably in Florence, and showing the influence of Leonardo in the face, eyelids, contours, and foreshortened hand of the Madonna. And of Fra Bartolommeo, perhaps, in the pyramidal composition and the draperies. The faces are now changed from the Perugino types shown in Nos. 141 and 145. The composition is also more graceful, the disposition of the figures on the panel freer, the feeling of space in the landscape greater. The painting is very good. Notice the doing of the hair of the Madonna, the Child, and the St. John at the left. Perhaps the best of the Raphaels in this collection, though the composition is not so mature as in No. 248.

248. * ——***Madonna and Child (The Colonna Madonna).*** This is the latest Raphael here. It is an oval of figures on an upright panel and happily carried out. It is much freer in drawing, better composed, and fills the space better in every way than his Peruginesque examples. As a piece of linear drawing showing Raphael's sense of line and as a graceful composition showing the feeling of action, even

though the figures are seated, it is a success. But aside from the design there is little to admire. The key of colour is different from the other Raphaels here. The handling is tentative and disturbing and, perhaps, shows another brush than Raphael's. It is difficult to reconcile it with Raphael's other work at this time. Notice the hair and compare it with the earlier No. 247A, or the drawing of the eyes in both Madonna and Child, or the left hand of the Madonna. Notice also the trees with their scant drawing and mannered foliage. The landscape is the same in handling as in the Raphael (No. 168) in the National Gallery, London. The picture is anomalous. It has Raphael's spirit, life, grace, movement, but it is not painted in Raphael's style nor in any other satisfactory manner. The design is excellent, but the surface lacks in distinction. It is said to be unfinished, but more likely the surface has been thumbed over by another hand.

823. **Rembrandt van Ryn.** ***Rape of Proserpina.*** The ascription of pictures to Rembrandt in the various European galleries is by no means satisfactory or even comprehensible. Almost all of the gallery catalogues confuse the student by placing pictures that contradict one another under the name of Rembrandt. The Berlin Catalogue is no exception. This is a little surprising, because its director (1912) is widely known as an authority on Rembrandt. Perhaps the various ascriptions here are justifiable, but let us meet the situation by frankly declaring the difficulty.

It may be accepted as fact that Rembrandt had, generally speaking, (1) an early period of producing pictures with a grey ground and a generally grey

tone—his grey period; (2) a middle period, when he used golden-browns and had golden backgrounds and draperies—his golden period; (3) a late period, when his hand seemed somewhat less interested in details, his colours became a little muddy, his surfaces somewhat thumbed, his general tone somewhat foxy—his hot, foxy period. Now, in none of these technical periods did he paint black or non-luminous shadows, or square-block hands, with long, square fingers, or heads without skulls and backs to them. Moreover, at no time in his career and in none of his pictures does he show the small trivial mind and hand of a Dou, or the inconstant mind and hand of a Bol, or the merely superficial mind and hand of a Poorter, or the wandering, desultory mind and hand of an Eeckhout. It is conceivable that he had a large workshop full of pupils and that, like Giovanni Bellini and others, he put the workshop stamp (his own signature) on pictures going out of his studio. That may account for some signatures on pictures which he almost certainly never painted. And it would also account in measure for the scarcity on the face of the earth of pictures by his pupils.

In the Berlin Gallery the pictures he probably painted may be roughly divided as follows:

The early grey period; nothing with certainty—Nos. 802, 808, and 810 are questionable.

The golden-brown period, or approaching it—Nos. 812, 828L.

The late dark or foxy period—Nos. 828A, 811A.

We now take up the pictures individually and in order, beginning with No. 823—The Rape of Proserpina.

The mental conception and the artistic sense in

the Rape of Proserpina are much too small for Rembrandt. He was of a universal mind and early saw and did things in a large way, as we know by the Lesson in Anatomy at The Hague, the Coppenol at Cassel, the Burggraef at Dresden. This picture cannot be put down as an early Rembrandt or in his early manner. It is the work of a mature hand seeing and painting in a small way, not drawing hard and sharp as a beginner always does, whether Velasquez or Rubens or Rembrandt. The sweet sky, the pretty foliage, the tricky overmodelled heads with the petty spots of light are wholly alien to Rembrandt's conception and only superficially reminiscent of his method of work. The real author of this picture is not so important to us as the establishment of the fact that Rembrandt did *not* do it. It was formerly ascribed to Jan van Vliet, and perhaps the small niggled vegetation in the foreground and the blue-green envelope were peculiar to him, for they were certainly never peculiar to Rembrandt. Houbraken thought it by the unknown Terlee. See the notes on Rembrandt at The Hague for different kinds of pictures attributed to him.

N. N. ——***The Rape of Europa.*** This is another illustration of a small point of view carried out in a sweet trifling method. It is in the style of Koninck or Willem de Poorter but far removed from Rembrandt, both mentally and technically. Notice the pretty sky and sea and foliage and the prettified Dutch types with their ballroom dresses. It is an unimportant picture, but it might be compared with the Dresden picture by Poorter, No. 1390. It does not at all agree with the six pictures of the Passion at Munich, put down as early Rem-

brandts, nor does it agree with the Rembrandts in this room. Mentally cut the figures out of this picture and the Proserpina (No. 823) and you will find the remaining landscapes will agree with each other fairly well, but they will not agree with any of the other Rembrandt backgrounds in the room. Cut the landscapes out, and the figures will again agree with each other fairly well but not with any other of the Rembrandt figures in the room.

812A. ——***Samson and Delilah.*** Probably by the same hand that did the Minerva (828C) and the Rape of Europa (N. N.) but done with more spirit. It is a pretty Delilah with pretty hands; and the yellow dress of Samson is pretty also—too much so for Rembrandt. Formerly listed as a Lievens.

828C. ——***Minerva.*** Possibly the work of the hand that did the Rape of Europa. And it is of corresponding quality—or its absence. It was once ascribed to Bol, but has been promoted to the Rembrandt rank where it does not belong. Thought to have been painted about 1631, and hence an early Rembrandt, but he probably never saw it. Notice the lack of strength in the type, the colour, the texture of the robe. Is this the hand that at this time did the Lesson in Anatomy? Frans Hals doing a picture in the style of Van der Werff, or Velasquez painting a pretty-faced Madonna in the smooth manner of Morales would not be more anomalous than this picture as a Rembrandt.

808. ——***Rembrandt's Portrait.*** A rather loosely done portrait of Rembrandt in his early or grey period. The shadow of the face is luminous but the surface looks as though it had been gone over several times.

The handling of the hat and feather, the chain and gorget are free. The modelling is soft or pumpkin-like. The work quite agrees with the authentic pictures of Jan Lievens. Moreover, there are ploughings or scratchings in the hair, done with the wooden end of the brush, which was a peculiar trick of this same Rembrandt follower—Jan Lievens.

810. ——***Rembrandt's Portrait.*** Another portrait in Rembrandt's grey period. A somewhat carelessly done portrait with luminous shadow and a grey ground. The right side of the face and the right eye seem to be hurt. Thought to have been done about 1634. It is not satisfactory because wanting in sureness of touch. Notice the figure for uncertainty of form.

802. ——***Samson Threatening His Father-in-Law.*** This is a large but by no means a strong picture. The head of Samson is well done without being remarkable; the shadows are luminous; the total colour effect is blue-grey. The architecture of the window and the head protruding from it are good illustrations of commonplace painting. See also the patterning of the dress which fails to hold at a distance. It is a school piece at best with another hand and eye than Rembrandt's apparent in its light, colour, and handling. The same hand probably did the Portrait of a Young Woman (No. 812) in the Hermitage, the head of a girl with flowers in her hair in the Ridder Collection, formerly loaned to the Staedel Institute, and possibly the Proserpine (No. 823) in this gallery. It is worth noting that the Samson here has the features of the man so often painted in different costumes by the Rembrandt School—the man we call Rem-

brandt. The man was probably none other than a studio model who had a fierce-looking, rather forceful face and was a favourite model with all the painters of the school. Why should Rembrandt paint himself thirty or more times? And how was it possible for Rembrandt or any other painter to see himself from thirty different points of view and paint himself in thirty different ways. A genius! Yes; but genius is remarkable always for its persistent singleness of view and method. It is the imitator who changes his view and method from time to time.

828D. ——*The Money-Changer.* This picture is again too small and petty in the surfaces for Rembrandt. Nor is the illumination or colour or drawing his. It is by a later man.

828L. ——*Anslo the Mennonite Preacher.* A large picture in Rembrandt's golden period, somewhat warm in colour but wanting in keen artistic interest or feeling. It is largely seen and painted with no tricky little high lights on hat brims or jewels. The whole is simple and broad. Notice the tablecloth, books, and candlestick for absence of sharp high lights. Notice also the clarity of the shadows, the drawing of the hands and heads, the placing of the figures in the room, the depth and air of the room. This is not inspired but it is a genuine work of a broad mind and brush such as Rembrandt possessed. It agrees quite perfectly with the Lesson in Anatomy and the Coppenol at Cassel. Compare it with the smaller examples here put down to him (Nos. 823, 828c), and then draw your own inferences. Its colour and shadow depths should be kept well in mind for future reference.

812. ——*Saskia.* In Rembrandt's grey-golden period. It is a little smooth in the flesh, the drawing of the mouth is weak, the eyes are not so well done as they might be, nor is the dress any too certain in its high lights. The over-cleaned hand still has some modelling about it. The lights on the jewels are a little spotty but very different from those of No. 828 or 828C. It was probably worked on by pupils after Saskia's death in 1642. It is dated 1643.

806. ——*Joseph's Dream.* A sketchy little affair, very good in colour and light, possibly by the painter of Daniel's Vision (828F) and Tobias and the Angel (No. 828N), which see and compare. Certainly not by Rembrandt.

828A. ——*Portrait of a Rabbi.* This picture is dated 1645, but it would seem from the handling to belong to a later period. The flesh is apoplectic and much thumbed, the beard is worked over and amended, the hands are hot in colour and laboured in their drawing. The shadow is still luminous, the cloak beautifully done, the chain not too prominently painted. It is not a good example of Rembrandt but, for the present at least, must be accepted as by him.

828E. * ——*Susanna.* Certainly a very Rembrandtesque picture. It is rather fine in the nude figure and brilliant in the red robe. It might have been done by Rembrandt, but the landscape and the handling of the high lights on the robes point to Eeckhout or some one of his ilk. There is no certainty about Eeckhout having done it, though it is probably by the same hand that did the figure in the Louvre (No. 2549) and the Woman Bathing in the National

Gallery, London (No. 54). It is nearer to Eeckhout than to Rembrandt.

828F. ——***Daniel's Vision.*** A picture of decided merit in its drawing of figures, its landscape, its colour, and its painting. But at just what period Rembrandt painted the pretty angel with the golden hair remains something of a mystery. Where else does he show this style or quality—in what picture, in what gallery? The picture comes nearer to a good example of Eeckhout or Bol. See Bol's picture in the Dresden Gallery (No. 1604). The angel in it is in the style of this angel. It agrees fairly well with the Tobias and the Angel picture in this gallery (No. 828N). Cut out the figures in these two pictures and notice how like are the landscapes. Then notice that these two landscapes do not agree at all with the two landscapes in the Europa and the Proserpina (Nos. N. N. and 823). The figures of the last two disagree just as radically with the figures of the first two. Is not this in itself some reason for thinking that there are two different hands at work here? But the Rembrandt problem is not confined to two men. The master is confused and confounded with a dozen or more of his pupils, and scores of the pupils' pictures are now masquerading under the master's name.

811A. ** ——***Man with the Golden Helmet.*** This model is sometimes called Rembrandt's brother, but for no particular reason save that gallery directors want fetching titles for their pictures. The same model was used by Bol and Flinck. It is a strong, powerfully done head and helmet, and is doubtless by Rembrandt, although the light-and-shade is erratic, and the whole work is not character-

istic. Something has happened to the face, perhaps, to darken it, but over the darkened face there is still a luminous (not a pot-black) shadow. It is a late picture, and heavily loaded with paint, as shown in the helmet. The face is much thumbed but very effective, very powerful. It is a masterpiece though apparently somewhat injured. Think of the man who could do such work as this at any time in his career doing the pretty Rape of Europa or the Proserpina! But it is unthinkable.

828. ——***Jacob Wrestling with the Angel.*** A poor picture whoever did it. In its present condition the flesh has anything but a flesh-like quality to it. Rembrandt's drawing is not apparent in the eyes or brows of the angel or in his hands or legs. Nor is his painting in the hair or the red coat of Jacob. It is unbelievable as a Rembrandt but conceivable as a Bol. The same angel (the model) appears in Bol's Abraham Receiving the Visit of Angels (No. 552) in the Rijks Museum, Amsterdam. And does not this same model appear again in Bol's Portrait of a Young Man in this room (No. 809A)?

828H. * ——***Potiphar's Wife Accusing Joseph.*** This is a late picture. The background is dark but not the shadows, which are still luminous. The handling is somewhat fumbling, as though Rembrandt's hand had lost its cunning. Notice the dresses and high lights for the lack of certainty in the touch. The general effect, however, is powerful and the colour rich. Probably painted in 1655. Eeckhout did things of a similar nature, but this seems too strong for him.

828B. * ——***Portrait of Hendrickje Stoffels.*** The name of Hendrickje Stoffels is a mere guess. No one

knows what she or Rembrandt's brother looked like. It is no great matter in art but is illustrative of the way in which history is manufactured from insufficient or wholly imaginary bases. This is an excellent picture but somewhat dark in the shadows of the eyes and neck and kneaded in the surfaces of the flesh and the dress. The hands are a little like Rembrandt's, as also the handling of the high lights. The colour is sombre. In order to make the picture correspond with the dates of Hendrickje's life the work is said to have been painted about 1658. The painting was formerly known as A Young Woman at a Window, and it bears some indication in the handling and light of having been done by Fabritius.

811. ——*Moses Breaking the Tables of Stone.* In its present condition the picture is not worth many words. It belongs in the class with No. 828. Rembrandt may have started both of them and abandoned them as failures; and perhaps they were signed and sold after his death; or perhaps he did not even touch them. No wonder people do not care for Rembrandt when such pictures as this are declared to be from his hand.

811c. ——*Study of the Head of Christ.* A good, strong head, freely done, but with nothing about it strongly indicative of Rembrandt. On the contrary, it seems not at all in his vein. This is equally true of No. 828m.

828m. ——*Portrait of a Young Jew.* Sketched in well but in no Rembrandtesque manner. See the small heads in the Antwerp Gallery, Nos. 294 and 295, for similar work.

828N. ——*Tobias and the Angel.* An excellent little picture, probably by the author of Daniel's Vision in this gallery (828F). Compare the types, the landscapes, the drawing, the handling of the two pictures. This one was once given to Flinck.

828J. * ——*Old Man with a Red Cap.* A Rembrandtesque study. It is dark brown in the ground, luminous in the shadow, and rich in the colour. The hands are only roughly laid in. A powerful sketch, probably by Eeckhout, not Rembrandt. The same model appears in the Eeckhout of the Amsterdam Gallery (No. 877), the Woman Taken in Adultery—the central figure of the man with the white turban. Besides, it is precisely in Eeckhout's style. See the notes on the Rembrandts at The Hague and at St. Petersburg.

405B. **Ribera, Jusefe (Lo Spagnoletto).** *St. Sebastian.* A beautifully drawn figure in Ribera's usual scheme of light, with a forced effect derived from the contrast of the flesh and the shadow. But strongly done.

112C. **Roberti, Ercole de'.** *John the Baptist.* Altogether out of proportion, hard and stringy in the drawing, withered in the flesh, but morbidly attractive like all the work of the early Ferrarese. The colour is a strange harmony. And what an odd landscape! It passed at one time as a Mantegna.

112D. ——*Madonna and Child.* This is also out of proportion like the John the Baptist (No. 112C). The Madonna is enormous. But how attractive she is! And what a strange blue robe! If one is seeking the unusual in art, here it is. And there are power and true feeling behind the oddity of view. The picture was once known as a Tura.

112E. ——*St. Jerome.* A large figure in a cardinal's robe, the red high in key and not marked in its shadows. The drawing is a little angular, the hands a bit wooden, the colour without restraint or modulation. On a gold ground.

157. **Romanino, Il (Girolamo Romani).** ***Madonna, Child, and Saints.*** The eyes are small and close together, as in the after-Giorgiones at Dresden (No. 186), at Budapest (No. 145), the Giorgiones in the Uffizi (Nos. 621, 630), and the Giorgione school piece of the National Gallery (No. 1173). The flesh is brown, like the Giorgione Concert in the Louvre. The colouring is rich in red and green, but the drawing is lax. An early example of Romanino following Giorgione, or, at least, by the same painter that did the Dresden, Florence, London, and Budapest pictures. The mannerism of the eyes running through all of them is supported by the similarity of the workmanship, the colour, the conception, the spirit.

157A. ——***Beheading of John the Baptist.*** Rather brutal in subject as in drawing, but not wanting in a rich colour effect. The German soldier at the right, with his handsome tunic and sleeves, should be noted.

155. ——***Salome.*** It is assigned to Romanino with a query, and is near to him if not directly by him. Giorgione imitators were numerous in Romanino's day. The picture has good colour. With narrow eyes, as in No. 157.

59. **Rosselli, Cosimo.** ***Madonna in Glory.*** A formal composition, too evenly balanced and too methodically done to be inspiring. The colour effect is rather poor. No. 59A also lacks in spirit and is

perfunctory though perhaps better in colour than No. 59.

762. **Rubens, Peter Paul.** ***Coronation of the Madonna.*** The figures are short and heavy for Rubens, and the notes of colour in the flesh and robes are not his. Notice the weakness of the cherubs at the bottom with their dreadful little wings that no painter of the Rubens stamp could have perpetrated. At the top the cherubs are even worse. It is probably a much-repainted school piece.

762A. * ——***Isabella Brandt.*** In the painter's early-middle manner, a picture clean, clear, and pure in the head and only slightly retouched elsewhere. Rubens was at this time (about 1610–15) quite supreme in his command of resources. How he draws! How flowingly and easily he paints! Notice the red shadows of the flesh which mark his earlier work rather than his later. The colour here is resonant and yet not loud or glaring. And what quiet dignity in the final result! The panel has been somewhat enlarged from its original form, which may account for the slurred fur at the right.

762B. ——***Conversion of Paul.*** A large canvas with much fine colour and headlong action. The shadows are a little dark. Notice the piling up of the figures diagonally on the canvas to give the effect of motion. Designed by Rubens but probably much painted upon by pupils. In other words, it is largely a workshop affair.

762C. ——***Diana with Nymphs Surprised by Satyrs.*** It belongs to the late period of Rubens. The figures are heavy and lumpy and the colour is brownish in the flesh shadows. It is suggestive of massive form and powerful modelling, but was probably

never entirely completed. There is a lack of finish in the satyr at the left, and also in the background at the right, compared with Diana herself. Somewhat injured and repainted, as notice, for example, the right hand and wrist of Diana.

763A. ——*The Repentant Magdalen.* It belongs to the late time of Rubens and is now injured by repainting in the figures, the landscape, and the sky. Notice the bad condition of the child's head at the right of the Magdalen or the profile of the angel. It is not a very spirited performance at the present moment and was probably never more than a school piece.

763B. ——*Venus and Adonis.* An early work and much cleaned but not noticeably repainted. For all the flaying of the surface there still remain some good drawing and colour. Notice the red shadows in the flesh-notes. Not a Rubens masterpiece but a bright picture which some critics declare to be a school copy. It was probably done by pupils of Rubens. A better version is in the Hermitage (No. 549). See the note upon it.

774. ——*Diana Hunting.* The animals are said to be by Snyders, the landscape by Wildens, and the figures by Rubens. The last allegation is questionable, and the whole picture, like so many collaborations in paint, is dull and heavy.

776A. ——*Neptune and Amphitrite.* This picture has not the Rubens quality in drawing, flesh colour, or handling. Notice the hard drawing in the face of Amphitrite, also in the Neptune and Cupid, and notice also the cheap painting in the hair of the nymph at the right, in the Amphitrite, and in the beard of Neptune. Compare them with the hair

in No. 783 or 762A, or even 776B, and the difference will be apparent at once. The picture has not a good piece of brush-work in it and is altogether a perfunctory affair, worthy, perhaps, of some imitator or assistant but not of Rubens himself. It looks like a copy of some sort, being too crude for even a school piece.

776B. ——***Bacchanal.*** According to the catalogue, this picture belongs to Rubens's middle period and was worked upon by Van Dyck. It is not a brilliant performance but has some good movement and enough good workmanship about it to make the picture on the opposite wall (No. 776A) look washed out and thin. Compare the handling in the hair, for instance, in the two pictures. The figure of the nude woman is very good. The picture is stained in spots and hurt by repainting—enough so to give a generally messy look to the surface. But it has colour and life to it still. An earlier version in the Munich Gallery (No. 754).

776C. * ——***Andromeda.*** A large and fine nude in the late style of Rubens, with very positive truth of form, bulk, and weight. And what large grace from head to foot there is about this generalised figure of Helene Fourment! The flesh colour is less clear than in Rubens's early works and the shadows are brownish, though perhaps some of this lack of clearness is due to staining and retouching. The background is merely brushed in but has a fine suggestion of the sea under a golden glow of sunset.

776F. ——***Portrait of Jean van Ghindertalen.*** A rather good profile, done easily, perhaps hastily, but effectively. You feel the head, the brows, the sharp nose, the thin hair, the coarse beard.

781. * ——*St. Cecilia.* The picture is still excellent in body as in spirit, and the robes have colour charm left though the surface has been much hurt and is sadly repainted. Look at the thumbed and daubed surfaces around St. Cecilia's head, about the cherub at the top, the one below, and the two at the left centre. The hair of the saint seems hurt by bitumen, as also her robe. The picture comes perilously near being a beautiful wreck, but it is still "beautiful." A late Rubens and originally a very fine one.

783. * ——*The Raising of Lazarus.* At one time this picture was arched at the top and the figures were arranged to repeat and complement the arch. The lines may still be seen at the top of the canvas. The figure of Christ is majestic and the two sisters kneeling are magnificently graceful. How right the drawing! Look at the arms, hands, feet. Notice the fine colour in the robes of the sisters. Painted in Rubens's earlier period, and possibly with the help of Van Dyck in the figures at the back, but for the main part it is by Rubens's own hand. Somewhat repainted but still a very fine picture, with much clarity and brilliancy showing in it.

785. ——*Perseus and Andromeda.* A peculiarly Flemish conception, ample in the proportions of the man, the horse, the cupids, the blushing lady. It may be questioned if Rubens himself did not think it a bit grotesque, a trifle too lumpy. It has been hurt across the face of Perseus and elsewhere and was never quite completed. One sometimes wonders if Rubens was responsible for it, but his underbasing, high lights, and handling still show in it.

798H. ——*St. Sebastian.* Stand across the room and * notice the glow of the flesh and the superb modelling of the chest and torso. This deep flesh glow should be compared with the surface gleam of the Neptune, No. 776A, to show how far removed from Rubens is the latter work. Somewhat hurt but still a powerful figure. The landscape has breadth about it and is not spotty with small high lights like so many of the alleged Rubens landscapes.

885. **Ruisdael, Jacob van.** *Landscape.* This is the stereotyped Ruisdael landscape, and yet it has a good realistic effect in the hillside and the small farm at its foot. See his smaller and better pictures, Nos. 885E, 885H, and 885J.

885G. ——*Eichenwald.* A very large and exceptionally * good example of Ruisdael. Here his landscape formula shows at its best and possesses not only style but some grandeur. There is an attempt at realism in the pond of the foreground, and in the white tree; but the full statement of Ruisdael's convention did not admit of too much realism. The colour is grey with a fine sky. A noble work.

884B. ——*Landscape with Ruins of a Cloister.* Evidently done with at least one eye on nature—on an actual scene—but warped by the painter's possession of a formula for doing landscape, a convention which he could not forget. Hence the dull light, the grey sky, water, and all that, which were not and are not generally true of Holland or any other country under the sun.

901C. **Ruysdael, Salomon van.** *Dutch Landscape.* A rather fine, diagonally composed landscape with a good sky and agreeable colour. This is Ruysdael

following Van Goyen and at his best. In fact, it is so good one wonders if it is a Salomon van Ruysdael at all.

240. **Sarto, Andrea del.** ***Portrait of a Young Woman.*** It is a study or sketch, probably of Andrea's wife Lucrezia, and has some spirit about it without being otherwise remarkable.

246. * ——***Madonna and Child Enthroned, with Saints.*** A large altar-piece that is of the earth earthy, so far as any religious sentiment is concerned. The types are heavy, even that of the Madonna—a conventionalised Lucrezia Fede. Everywhere the saints are unsaintly, material, almost gross. But as composition, as light-and-shade, as glowing colour, what more could you ask? Originally it must have been a fine piece of drawing and colour, and is so yet, though the surface has been much restored and repainted.

63B. **Sassetta (Stefano di Giovanni).** ***Madonna and Child.*** By a painter possessed of the Sienese religious sentiment to an extent that rather warps his faces and figures from the natural. Notice the graceful little angels with the crown, the elongated Child, and the Madonna so very tender in feeling. The sentiment is very refined and even the workmanship is full of feeling.

63C. ——***Madonna and Child with Two Saints.*** It is done in a different style and manner from No. 62B. The figures are angular, badly drawn, but with some pathos and fineness of feeling.

63D. ——***Mass of St. Francis.*** The picture is beautiful even in its regularity and primness. The spirit is unusual in its intentness and the style is simplicity itself. Notice the charming doing of the window

above St. Francis and the passage at the right. The drawing of the altar is a little askew, but the whole setting of the interior of the church is convincing, true, and delightful in its feeling.

307. ——**Savoldo, Girolamo.** ***A Venetian Woman.*** It is not unlike No. 1031 in the National Gallery, London, only here the sheeny cloak is golden-brown instead of silver. The texture of the cloak evidently pleased the painter more than the figure within it. It is a superficial effect.

307A. ——***Mourning the Dead Christ.*** The painter's mannerisms (as, for instance, the painting of the Magdalen's dress) rather weaken the general effect, but it is a dignified attempt to do something large and not an altogether unsuccessful one. The colour has been darkened by age but was originally deep-toned.

1234B. * **Schaffner, Martin.** ***Two Altar-Wings.*** Shown on both sides in four panels. The subjects are Sts. Luke, Andrew, Mark, and Gregory. They are all of them substantial, well-drawn figures in ornamental robes. Gold work at the back. The four panels make a rich effect and have a good deal of force about them as decoration.

1162. **Schiavone, Gregorio.** ***Madonna Enthroned.*** A picture that shows decided Paduan influence and teaching in the sky, the angels, the Madonna, the stone chair. Highly decorative in colour, in gold work, in the architecture, grapes, beads. Odd, almost grotesque in types, it nevertheless possesses strength and individuality.

1629. **Schongauer, Martin.** ***Adoration of the Kings.*** With bright, clear colour and drawing that matches

it in clearness. In connection with the side pieces, Nos. 1629A, 1629B (of poorer work but probably a part of the same altar-piece), it makes a brilliant spot on the wall. There are figures on the reverse of the wings. Not to be accepted as entirely representative of Schongauer, who was a man of much strength.

644A. **Scorel, Jan van.** ***Madonna and Child.*** An attractive, winning Madonna and Child but not a representative example of Scorel, who was a draughtsman of force and power. The flowers in the hand are worth looking at and the colour has music in it in connection with those far hills. No. 153 is even less representative of Scorel.

808A. **Seghers, Hercules.** ***Holland Landscape.*** With the thunder-cloud of Seghers in the centre—his usual earmark. An excellent landscape by a painter whose work has passed and still passes in certain galleries and auction rooms under the name of Rembrandt.

806B. ——***Holland Landscape.*** A flat country with a wide sky. There is no thunder-cloud in the sky this time. A nice piece of colour, light, and air.

1132 } **Sellajo, Jacopo del.** ***The Death of Julius Cæsar.***
1133 } These two panels are remarkable pieces of colouring as well as costuming. Notice the ornate quality of the robes and their decorative effect.

1142. **Sienese School.** ***The Annunciation.*** It is similar in types to the large Simone Martini and Lippo Memmi in the Uffizi (No. 23). It belongs in the same school with the Uffizi picture but is probably not by the same hand.

79A. ** **Signorelli, Luca.** ***Pan.*** A very important picture, and painted for Lorenzo de' Medici, perhaps, as the catalogue suggests. It is not now attractive in colour. It is harsh and hot and the draperies are leathery in texture. The shadows are cut sharp against the lights on arms and legs, giving the effect of square-block modelling, and the outlines are black-rimmed. The female figure at the left has large grace about it and the seated figure at back some sentiment with much beauty of form and drapery. But power is the quality most apparent. The figures of the men are strong, bronze-like types full of a large feeling for line and linear drawing, full of power. The classic-pastoral spirit of it may be interpreted in various ways. The picture has probably been hurt or stained. An early work. For Signorelli's softer mood see the female figures in No. 79.

79. ——***St. Catherine and the Magdalen.*** Two panels or altar wings belonging to the late period of the master. There is more sentiment than in No. 79A, but the drawing is less sure, less positive, though by no means lacking or insufficient. The draperies are angular and hard and the faces and hands are sharply outlined. The colour in the floor is variegated as in the London National Gallery picture (No. 1128). The Magdalen is the better figure and very fine in colour. The figure back of her is effective in the white head-dress. The second altar wing contains a fine figure of St. Catherine, charming in sentiment, beautifully drawn in the draperies, and good in colour.

79C. * ——***Portrait of an Old Man.*** Done in Signorelli's usual dry, hard, leathery style, but with ex-

cellent line drawing, strong characterisation, and forceful truth. What a jaw and chin! What a drawing of eyes and nose and face outline! The head is comparable to the Mantegna (No. 9) but is not so easily done, perhaps, nor so clever in the use of reds and whites. The figures and architecture at the back were put in to fill space or suggest the sitter's calling in life.

79B. ——*Visitation.* Notice the filling of the circular space with colour and figures. The types are rather harsh and the colour a little hot, but the Madonna is nice in feeling and the two men have a rugged strength. Even in so small a subject and so gentle a theme Signorelli shows himself a draughtsman of power.

1070A. **Simone Martini.** *Entombment.* It has fine dramatic quality in the figures and clear, pure colour. The background, painted in long after the figures, perhaps, has changed in colour. Other portions of this altar-piece at the Louvre (No. 1383) and Antwerp (Nos. 257–260) have gold backgrounds. Notice the patterns of the haloes.

109. **Sodoma, Il (Giovanni Antonio Bazzi).** *Charity.* A large and somewhat exaggerated figure not lacking so much in grace as in force. The children are interesting. The landscape is a little matter-of-fact and commonplace.

225. **Solario, Andrea.** *Portrait of a Man.* The eyes are placed somewhat askew, but it is a rather good portrait, being coarsely reminiscent of Antonello da Messina.

408C. **Spanish School.** *Portrait of a Man.* A good portrait, whoever its author, but not of that vital

quality or spirit that makes it great art. Once put down to Velasquez but it is too superficial and glittering for him. [Changed (1914) to the Flemish School.]

27A. **Squarcione, Francesco.** ***Madonna and Child.*** * This picture and a school piece at Padua are the only pictures that can be traced to the master of Mantegna and the founder of the Paduan School. This Berlin panel shows the influence of Donatello's bas-reliefs rather than that study of the antique which has heretofore been put down as Squarcione's controlling influence. It is likely that Mantegna, too, received some of Donatello's influence, possibly through Squarcione. This picture shows a hard, medallion-like profile of the Madonna with a beautiful halo about the head. The pattern of fruit was afterward adopted by many painters, as were also the flaky sky and the parapet. The colour is excellent. A notable picture that is now somewhat hurt.

795B. **Steen, Jan.** ***The Quarrel.*** Done in a large, broad way, well drawn and freely painted, but blackish in the shadows. The still-life on the table and floor, the head, arm, and right hand of the man in blue are notable. Steen was a painter, whether you like his themes or not. See also No. 795.

795D. ——***The Baptism.*** A large Steen fairly good in its interior setting. The planes of the picture are well maintained and the colour values are quite true. The subject is not more interesting than Steen's usual themes, the colour effect is a little deeper, the shadows a little darker, and the light rather harsh and cold.

795c. ——*Gay Company.* In Steen's free manner, perhaps a bit careless in its doing, but full of spirit, good painting, and excellent colour.

1006. **Stoop, Dirck.** *Hunting-Dogs.* A small picture which should not be passed unnoticed. It is well drawn and good in colour.

583a. **Strigel, Bernhard.** *St. Norbert.* With richness in the red and an old-ivory hue in the white. Very beautifully done in the robes, with figures that stand well. At the back a green-blue landscape.

1673. **Swabian School.** *The Trinity.* Odd in the drawing of the throne, but what wonderful detail in it! Also what colour in the robes of the Father and the Son! The gold ground is very brilliant. The red and green robes of the women at right are a little out of tone.

791. * **Terborch, Gerard.** *Paternal Advice.* The silver of the satin is foremost in evidence as in all Terborch's costume pictures. There are good drawing, colour, and texture painting all through, except at the back of the young lady's head where there has been some repainting, perhaps. The background is lost in gloom. Another version in the Amsterdam Gallery (No. 570).

791a, 791b ——*Portraits of Man and Wife.* Both pictures are a trifle hard and glassy in surfaces, but these are straightforward people done in a simple, direct way. They are a little painted-to-order, perhaps, but still where shall we see finer types among Terborch's contemporaries?

791d. ——*Portrait of a Man.* Once, perhaps, a noble portrait but now stained and hurt. There is still

good colour—in the table-cloth, for instance, or in the chair.

791E. ——*Portrait of a Man.* Hurt by the blistering of the robes and the staining of the table-cloth. What dignity and carriage in the figure! Terborch in small portraits is quite unexcelled, though these are not the best examples of them.

791F. * ——*The Smoker.* Not particularly interesting in subject but very well painted. It is largely seen and handled. Notice the doing of the face, hair, and cap, the heavy hands and the soiled sleeves. This is drawing and painting of an impeccable kind. It could hardly be improved upon.

791G. ——*The Concert.* The figure at the back playing the spinet is unhappily placed because the spinet cuts away the figure and creates the impression of a coloured terra-cotta bust in the corner of the room. In subordinating this second figure to the foreground figure the painter lost its value. The picture wants in the feeling of space. The dress of the chief figure is good in texture though the waist has no body in it. The head, neck, and shoulders are rather fine.

791H. ——*Young People Drinking Wine.* The colour is slate-grey, the background flat. The picture has been repainted in the faces, hands, and elsewhere. Not the best Terborch in the gallery though it has some colour and good textures in that familiar satin gown.

N. N. **Tiepolo, Giovanni, Battista.** *The Tiepolo Room.* A room with frescoes in grey and white on golden-yellow grounds. It should be studied not only for its fine decorative quality but also for the life and movement of the figures.

459B. ——***Martyrdom of St. Agatha.*** This was originally painted for church decoration rather than for gallery exhibition, and it suffers by its light scheme of colour being brought into contrast with the other pictures in the room. Easily and freely handled, with a staccato edge to the draperies not altogether pleasant.

459C. * ——***Bearing the Cross.*** A sketch for the original picture in S. Alvise, Venice, and most interesting in its freedom of handling. The verve of the artist is in this first impression. Notice the bent figures at the left, the fainting figure of the Christ, the plunging horse. Notice also the fine colour and the serene sky. It is masterful.

298. * **Tintoretto, Jacopo (Robusti).** ***Portrait of a Procurator of St. Mark.*** A dignified character in rich robes, painted with perhaps a trifle too much emphasis in the high lights, but otherwise a sterling performance. It has darkened by time and been hurt in spots by restoration.

298A. ——***Annunciation.*** It is hung too high (1912) to judge of its condition or its painter, but it can be seen so far as its general conception goes. This latter is not remarkable. Tintoretto painted the subject more elaborately and better in the Scuola S. Rocco at Venice. Besides, the spirit here is a little affected. The angel and the Madonna are both too conscious. Evidently somewhat repainted. Attribution questionable.

299. * ——***Portrait of a Procurator of St. Mark.*** It is, perhaps, the same sitter as shown in No. 298B, but painted at a different age. No. 299 is a little vivid in its red robe, and has been somewhat repainted, but is nevertheless a powerful head. The land-

scape at the right is perhaps hot but effective. Tintoretto does not always show to such good advantage as a portrait painter as in this picture.

300. ——***Madonna and Child with Sts. Mark and Luke.*** It is cold in colour but there is much grace about the Madonna and Child bending forward. Composed as an oval of figures on an upright panel. A late picture and possibly worked on by pupils.

310. ** ——***Luna and the Hours.*** This is a picture that gives some hint of Tintoretto's imagination. What splendid heads, figures, arms, robes, draperies! Notice the Michelangelesque quality in the head, bust, and arms of the driver of the car. The draperies pushed back by the wind and the tightened chains (though there are no horses apparent) give the feeling of sweeping through space. Diana, the moon goddess, by the fling back of her figure, gives the further feeling of flight. The surface does not look much like Tintoretto's work, though cleaning or retouching may have produced its smoothness. A fine composition and a splendid harmony of colour.

316. ——***Venetian Procurators.*** With a view across the Venetian lagoons at back. The St. Mark is fairly good. The picture has been damaged and besides one may entertain doubts about Tintorreto's hand in it.

160A. * **Titian** (**Tiziano Vecellio**). ***Portrait of a Daughter of Roberto Strozzi.*** Unfortunately this charming portrait has been over-cleaned and repainted in the hand, arm, and face. The white dress is apparently stained in the centre, from the girdle down, or at least changed in value. Originally a beautiful picture—"wonderful," Vasari calls it—though

perhaps too much composed and not quite simple or direct enough. It is about the only child's portrait that Titian painted, and has been much praised by Aretino and others. The red of the robe, the blue of the sky, the bas-relief, the landscape are still fine in colour. The chain about the waist and hanging down the dress is now more convincing than the pearls; but the whole surface has been injured by cleaning.

161. ——***Portrait of Admiral Giovanni Moro.*** A large, powerful head with a massive brow. The armour glitters too much and the figure protrudes too much for Titian. A commanding personality and a very good portrait, however. Ascribed by Berenson to Dossi.

163. * ——***Portrait of the Painter.*** It was never quite finished by the painter, though he carried the head as far as he thought best, no doubt. It has vigour and life about it, though haste is apparent in the hands, the dress, the high lights. Look at it from across the gallery and notice how firm it is and how well it carries. What a poise it has, what a set-in, what atmosphere! Titian up to the last could see and paint the large and essential truths—the universal truths. Therein lay the larger part of his greatness. He shows this grasp of the large and the universal even better in the later portrait of himself at Madrid.

166. ——***Titian's Daughter, Lavinia.*** A very popular picture, much copied, engraved, and photographed, but never very strong and always rather sweet. It is probably an idealised portrait of Titian's daughter and prettified in process. In its present condition it is hurt by cleaning and retouching but

still has some fine colour about it. The head, neck, and shoulder are excellent, as also the fruit and landscape. There are several variations of the same subject, the one at Madrid being the most notable, perhaps.

301. ——***Portrait of a Young Man.*** The head might pass muster as a Titian, for it is not badly done though somewhat repainted; but what shall we say about the figure? The body is flat, formless, almost diaphanous, and the head does not fit it or belong to it except by a stretch of the imagination. Could or did Titian do such a body? Or has the whole picture, perhaps, been restored to death instead of to life? Formerly attributed to Tintoretto—a guess that is not so near the mark as Titian.

111. **Tura, Cosimo.** ***Madonna and Child Enthroned, with Four Saints.*** ** A large and perhaps the most important example of Tura in existence. It is somewhat disturbing at first because of the many small objects that enter into the composition. The enthroned Madonna is the central figure to which the four saints pay a nominal allegiance, but the smaller objects in and about the throne worry the eye with their insubordination. Moreover, the figures at the sides, in the lunettes, the landscape under the throne, the lion, the eagle, and all that do not help the unity of the picture, however interesting they may be as decorative morsels. Aside from this distracting feature, the detail, by itself considered, is really wonderful, especially in the architecture, the throne, the bas-reliefs, the costumes, the landscape. Notice that the minutiæ are carried so far as the placing of a city in the crystal

held by the eagle's claw. The drawing is severe, the draperies angular, liny as though studied from wet linen, or falling in regular patterns or repeated lines, and the figures are not select but ill-proportioned, knotty in the joints. The whole work, however, is full of great truth and sincerity. The colour is without charm, but it has a strong and pure decorative quality, even in its harshness, that seems effectively to supplement the savage drawing. There is a touch of love and sweetness here and there as in the little angels at the top. Somewhat hurt in the faces. The flesh colour has gone brown, but the total effect of colour with the gold mosaic work at the back is still highly decorative. A fine altar-piece.

1170B. ——*St. Sebastian.* A picture in Tura's style with insistent drawing and prominent joints. The figure is hard and almost grotesque. The gold ground is disturbing in its brightness.

1170C. ——*St. Christopher.* A companion piece to 1170B with a similarly drawn figure and drapery that is cast in waves. At the bottom an excellent study of the sea. A picture of force not only in drawing but in the note of blue.

1635. **Ugolino da Siena.** ***Peter, Paul, and John the Baptist.*** A large and rather important altar-piece, to be looked at as a whole for its fine decorative quality in the gilding, the tooling, the colours. Notice the angels over the pointed panels and above them the small heads in the crosspiece. See also Nos. 1635A and 1635B.

413C. **Velasquez, Diego de Silva y.** ***Mariana, Sister of Philip IV.*** It is by no means a mediocre portrait though it has not the touch of Velasquez.

The curtain is hardly his in colour or handling, nor the handkerchief, nor the ruff, nor the hair, nor the hands. It is some school work, rather too good for most of the Velasquez pupils and yet not good enough for Velasquez himself. The feeling of paint on the surface of the dress is suggestive of Mazo's method of work.

413E. ——***Portrait of a Lady.*** This is probably a school piece and is not a bad portrait though by no means an inspiration. The head and face are well drawn and the figure sufficiently indicated. There is slight indication of Velasquez in the drawing or handling. Besides, the hands suggest a feebler master.

413F. ——***Three Musicians.*** It is a good piece of hard realism, such as Velasquez did in his youth and years after him Manet repeated. Look at the still-life. The heads are very well done, and possibly Velasquez did them, but Ribalta and Pacheco did just such things before Velasquez. The drawing is accurate, if hard.

413A. ** ——***Portrait of Alessandro del Borro.*** When and where—in what pictures—did Velasquez ever paint this kind of a portrait, with a column, a flag, and a Netherland burgher in Netherland costume? Who of the Spanish School ever did anything of the kind? The picture is certainly not by Velasquez, is not Spanish, and even the Borro part of it, as established by the flag, is a case where too much has been derived from the evidence. On its face the picture is of Netherland origin. The Dutch painters of Amsterdam reproduced the type, pose, costume, column, flag again and again, in their shooting-company pictures. At first, in con-

nection with the bulk and pose of the figure, one thinks of Van der Helst. In his portrait of Gerard Bicker, in the Amsterdam Museum (No. 1140), one finds the hair, the forehead drawing, the eyes, mouth, and double chin of the Borro, varied somewhat and yet practically the same. The pose of the Borro, the wrist and hand, the blacks are found in Van der Helst's shooting-company picture (No. 1134), in the Amsterdam Museum, and the left hand of the Borro appears again in the Paul Potter portrait, by Van der Helst, at The Hague Museum. Other resemblances appear in other portraits by Van der Helst, but there is always a feeling that the Borro is too strong and not smooth enough in surface or drawing for Van der Helst. Another possibility arises in Jordaens. The portrait of Admiral Ruyter, in the Louvre (No. 2016), presents striking analogies of type, and the drawing of the chin and forehead is alike. Elsewhere, as in portraits at St. Petersburg and Madrid, such features of costume as the bag breeches and cut velvet appear; the peculiar drawing of the right wrist shows again in a portrait at Budapest (No. 438), and the column is frequently seen in Jordaens's figure compositions. Moreover, there is a brutal strength, a bulk and body, a feeling of physical presence that strongly indicate Jordaens. Finally, the flesh-notes, with their tendency to warmth, and the handling of the brush with its tendency to load in lumps are characteristic of Jordaens. It seems nearer to Jordaens than to Van der Helst, and there is nothing about it that a man of Jordaens's originality and ability could not have done.

It is a superb portrait. The bulk of it, the aplomb of it are superb. The present composi-

tion is odd, and the grey strip of paint at the left of the figure suggests that we have not here the whole of the story. This may have been a figure in a group that was cut away from the main composition. But, in any event, it is a fine presentation.

Venetian School. See Bartolommeo Veneto.

912B. ** **Vermeer (or Van der Meer) of Delft, Jan.** ***Lady with Pearl Necklace.*** This picture is supreme in light and just as fine in its delicate colour. The face, hands, and background are scrubbed too much, and the lady is now pallid and grey; but it is doubtful if that has hurt the general colour effect, which seems quite perfect just as it is. Notice the richness of colour in the blue cloth and vase, the beauty of the yellow in the dress repeated in the window-curtain and suggested again in the back of the chair. Notice also the foreshortened picture on the wall and the frame of the window. A work of rare beauty and one of the best Vermeers in existence. No trace of *pointillisme*, or dotting with the brush, is here apparent; no spottiness, no hardness. See the note on the Vermeers at The Hague.

912C. ——***Man and Woman with Wine.*** The figures have no great charm as personalities but are effective as colour masses in the composition. The colour, with its repeated notes of blue and red, has not the refinement of No. 912B, and the light is cruder and less diffused. The textures, as in the jug, are very well rendered and the room is rightly indicated. It is a very obvious performance and has no mystery about it, but it is to be admired for all that. There is a note of blue in the light and air peculiar to some Vermeers. With slight traces

of *pointillisme* but not nearly so marked as at Amsterdam (No. 2528A).

309. **Veronese, Paolo Caliari.** ***Minerva and Mars.*** With a well-modelled back of Minerva and a questionable front of Mars. A workshop piece in company with Nos. 303 and 311. They have good colour and some fair drawing.

326 } ——***Jupiter, Juno, Cybele, and Genii.*** This group
330 } of pictures is set in the ceiling of Room 42 and
* gives one a very good idea of how the group may have looked in the Pisani palace at Venice, for which it was originally painted. It is not a wonderful decoration for Paolo and yet looks wonderfully well because the gallery direction here has had enough imagination to give it a proper setting.

104A } **Verrocchio, Andrea.** ***Madonna and Child.***
108 } The authorship of these pictures may be open to
* question, but possibly the painter of No. 104A also did No. 108, and both pictures are interesting studies for the connoisseur. They belong to a series of Madonnas of Florentine origin much confused and not readily assigned to their painters. No. 104A is clumsy in form, hard in drawing, as in the hands, with rather acrid colour and yellow-brown flesh shadows. The landscape is suggestive of Lorenzo di Credi. Compare it with No. 108 for resemblances in the head-dresses, hands, shadows, landscapes. An early work and related to No. 296 in the National Gallery, London.

93. **Verrocchio, Workshop of.** ***The Christ Child and St. John.*** The landscape is most interesting and the two figures charming in movement. The latter suggest Lorenzo di Credi without leading to any conclusion. The Verrocchio workshop picture,

No. 80, in this gallery is possibly by the same painter that did the Costanza de' Medici (No. 2490) in the National Gallery, London, there assigned to Lorenzo di Credi.

38. * **Vivarini, Alvise.** ***Madonna and Child Enthroned, with Six Saints.*** A good Venetian altar-piece well framed and well placed in the gallery. It is a little hard in the drawing (see the St. Sebastian) and stiff in the robes, but very sincere in spirit and just as true in feeling as the Bellini altar-pieces of the time. The architecture of the throne and hall is magnificent, the robes rich in colour, the armour done in a convincing manner. The figures rise in an arch and suggest or repeat the architecture at the top. The general colour scheme is somewhat uncertain. The playing angels below are attractive. See the note on No. 1143 put down to Bartolommeo Vivarini's workshop.

1165. * ——***Madonna and Child with Four Saints.*** (In the chapel on the first floor.) This altar-piece is seen to good advantage in its present setting but not by standing near it. It is a large panel and should be seen from some distance. A simple pyramidal group, rounded up at the top to meet the arch, with supporting saints on either side. The drawing is a trifle frail, or perhaps the types give that impression, but the colour is rich and harmonious. A fine altar-piece.

5. * **Vivarini, Antonio.** ***Adoration of Kings.*** Done in the early time of the painter, when under the influence of Gentile da Fabriano, the catalogue says, but it is, perhaps, nearer to Gentile himself without being directly by him. It is some Gentile school or workshop piece. It is too reminiscent of the

Adoration in the Florence Academy, by Gentile, to be very far removed from him. It is beautiful in its decorative scheme of colours and gold with modelled and gilded stucco showing in the crowns, haloes, and jewels. The robes are superb. The heads show many indications of individual faces—direct studies from nature. This is also apparent in the horses, trees, flowers, the distance, and the effect of sunlight on the hills. It is the beginning of nature study in the early time and is founded on Gentile da Fabriano's teaching and example.

1058. ——***Life of the Madonna.*** Six panels fine in colour quality of which the one of the Adoration may be compared with No. 5 for similarity of workmanship. All the panels are decorative and quite honest in feeling. They show Gentile da Fabriano's influence and perhaps Pisanello's. The catalogue queries the attribution to Vivarini.

1160. **Vivarini, Bartolommeo.** ***St. George.*** The horse is wooden but St. George is very noble, and the rescued lady at the right is unconsciously prayerful in her beautiful robes. The landscape shows a walled city. It is probably a Muranese workshop picture. The background is hurt by repainting.

1143. **Vivarini, Bartolommeo, Workshop of.** ***Altar-Piece.*** Large but not very good in quality. It is interesting as a study of early Muranese art. The angels, with Christ, at the top are the best part of it. It shows types used afterward by Crivelli and also Alvise Vivarini. Compare it with the work in No. 38 in this gallery, put down to Alvise, beginning with the eyes. It is possibly a workshop piece belonging to Alvise rather than to Bartolommeo Vivarini.

1170A. **Vivarini, School of the.** ***Mourning over the Christ.*** It has suffered in its surface and was always, perhaps, a harsh piece of drawing, but there is a tragic quality about it. The colour at one time had the same hard strength as the drawing. [Now (1913) put down to Bastiani.]

832. **Vos, Cornelis de.** ***The Painter's Daughters.*** Two charming little Flemish girls, in the costume of the time, seated on the floor. They are thought to be the painter's daughters. Notice the naturalistic grouping, the patterns of the dresses, the odd shoes. It is a rather dry piece of painting but effective characterisation and good colour. These children appear again in the Vos Family picture at Brussels (No. 503).

534A. **Weyden, Roger van der.** ***Miraflores Altar-Piece.*** A triptych with a Pietà in the centre, Christ Appearing to the Magdalen, and a Madonna Adoring in the wings. The figures are pathetic, tragic, with robes well handled and fairly good in colour. The figure of Christ is attenuated but effective. There are beautiful landscapes at the back. The small bits of architectural sculpture are carefully drawn in detail, but they are disturbing to the picture as a whole because they are out of tone. The blue and purple cherubim at the top holding crowns do not add to the ensemble of the picture. The left wing, with its green, red, and white colour, is the least pleasing of the three panels. This is one of the best-authenticated examples of Roger's work known to history, and even if it be merely a copy, as seems probable from its look, it should still be used as a criterion of the master's early manner and method—his types, architecture, landscape,

and general composition. Compare it carefully with No. 535 and its lack of quality and its timid drawing and handling, indicative of the copy, will be apparent.

534B. ——***John the Baptist Altar-Piece.*** The architecture is not in a key of light with the figures and is disturbing to the composition (see the pictures by Marmion in this gallery, Nos. 1645 and 1645A, for architecture true in tone). The inner views at right and left are very picturesque, the scene at right far back being very animated and full of colour. A good piece of work but not homogeneous in effect. It is probably a good old copy—better than No. 534A—but nevertheless *after* the master and not *by* him.

535. ** ——***The Middelburg Altar-Piece.*** A triptych with an Adoration in the centre and Christ Appearing in the two wings. A well-known picture of fine quality. It is good in both sentiment and workmanship. The central panel is a balanced composition, with a Madonna in white and a magnificent donor in black, supposed to be Pierre Bladelin, at the right. Notice the angels above and below and the landscape. The panel at the left is quite wonderful in the texture painting of the brocade worn by the kneeling figure. What marvellous tones of blue, green, red, yellow, gold are here brought together! The right panel is quite as fine as the left with a welter of jewels, robes, colours. A walled city at the back. It seems almost too elaborate for Roger as we know him at the Escorial and Madrid. Some there be who think it by a younger Van der Weyden, and others there are who simply plead ignorance. There are many things yet to

be learned about Roger and his style. This is the best work attributed to Roger in this gallery and is apparently an original work, not a copy. It should be compared with Nos. 101–103 in the Munich Gallery.

545. * ——***Charles the Bold.*** A fine portrait, full of sensitive perception and done with great simplicity. There is nothing theatrical or even dramatic about it as one might expect from the man portrayed. It is plain truth carried out with exact detail and telling effect. Supposed by some to have been painted by a Roger van der Weyden II, as also No. 535, but there is not too much logic in the conclusion. It looks retouched, is a little soft in the drawing, and in such features as the chain and the hand it suggests the copyist.

545D. * ——***Portrait of a Young Woman.*** The colour here is as fine as the firm outline drawing. It is simple, direct, excellent work. How well the eyes, nose, and mouth are drawn, the head-dress painted, the dress and hands given! It is masterful. It possibly belongs earlier than Roger—belongs, perhaps, to that shadowy "School of Robert Campin" to which bothersome pictures of the time are now being relegated.

534C. * ——***St. Margaret and St. Apollonia.*** The type, with the light, the colour, the gold work, the landscape, seems entirely different from Roger's other work here, notably No. 535. The picture seems nearer to Christus though the hands deny him. No one knows who did it, but is it not a beautiful picture in every way? How could it have been done better?

1656. **Witz, Konrad.** ***Christ on the Cross.*** Notice the placing of the red, blue, and yellow in the robes of the figures at the back and its result as a colour harmony. With an excellent background.

1170. * **Zoppo, Marco.** ***Madonna and Child, Enthroned, with Four Saints.*** The figures are squat and heavy, the draperies harsh, uneasy in line, and full of odd wrinkles, the colours brilliant but out of tone, the landscape fantastic, erratic, and the detail of flowers and fruit minute and painstaking. The total result is rather disturbing because, unlike the Panetti (No. 113) near at hand, the figures stand *out* of the landscape (almost fall out of the picture frame), instead of standing *in* and keeping their place. Historically, a most interesting picture and pictorially possessed of rugged force and good feeling if not a gracious style. Examined in the detail it is really remarkable, but taken as a whole it lacks in ensemble. Somewhat hurt in the Madonna and Child by repainting.

404A. **Zurburan, Francisco de.** ***St. Bonaventura.*** One of four pictures giving scenes from the life of St. Bonaventura—one in the Dresden Gallery and two in the Louvre. This one shows good drawing in the heads and gowns but is too dark in light and colour, too rectangular in pattern to be agreeable art.

404C. ——***Portrait of a Boy in Armour.*** A very substantial boy who stands solidly if awkwardly. The legs are wooden, like those in the portraits sometimes attributed to Velasquez. The huge trousers, the splendid armour, and the red sash are well done.

INDEX OF PICTURES BY NUMBERS

S. 1. Garbo, R. del.
2. Cima.
4. Basaiti, Pseudo-
5. Vivarini, Ant.
S. 5. Mantegna.
7. Cima.
S. 8. Catena.
9. Mantegna.
10A, 11 } Bellini, Giovanni.
12. Bellini, School of.
S. 12. Italian School.
12A. Giorgione.
S. 13. Italian School.
14. Carpaccio.
15, 17 } Cima.
18, 18A } Antonello da Messina.
19. Catena.
S. 20, S. 21 } Bruyn.
21. Ghirlandajo, Dom.
23, 23A } Carpaccio.
25. Antonello da Messina, School of.
26. Girolamo da Santa Croce.
27. Mantegna.
27A. Squarcione.
28. Bellini, Giovanni.
29. Mantegna.
30. Girolamo dai Libri.
31. Palma Vecchio.
37. Basaiti.
38. Vivarini, Alvise.
39. Previtali.
43. Bissolo.
44, 44B } Montagna.
46A. Liberale da Verona.
46C. Bonsignori.
47. Fogolino.
47A. Castagno.
49. Pennacchi.
51, 52 } Borgognone.
54, 54A } Melozzo da Forlì.
55. Conti.
58. Lippi, Fra Filippo.
58A, 58B } Masaccio.
59. Rosselli.
60, 60A } Angelico, Fra.
60B, 60C } Benozzo Gozzoli.
63B, 63C, 63D } Sassetta.
69. Lippi, Fra Filippo.
73. Pollajuolo, Piero.

73A. Pollajuolo, Antonio.
78. Botticelli.
78A. Lippi, Filippino.
79, 79A, 79B, 79C } Signorelli.
81. Botticelli.
82. Lippi, Filippino.
83, 85 } Mainardi.
90. Garbo, R. del.
90B. Leonardo da Vinci.
93. Verrocchio, Workshop of.
95. Lippi, Fra Filippo.
95A. Pisanello.
96, 96A } Lippi, Filippino.
98. Garbo, R. del.
100. Credi.
101. Lippi, Filippino.
102, 102A } Botticelli.
103. Credi.
104A. Verrocchio.
106, 106A, 106B } Botticelli.
107. Piero di Cosimo.
108. Verrocchio.
109. Sodoma.
111. Tura.
112. Costa.
112C, 112D, 112E } Roberti.
113. Panetti.
115. Costa.
115A. Cossa.
122. Francia.
129. Fiorenzo di Lorenzo.
131. Palmezzano.
132. Bertucci.
132A. Pinturicchio.
I. 133. Foppa.
137A. Bonfigli.
141. Raphael.
143. Pinturicchio.
145, 147 } Raphael.
153. Lotto.
155, 157, 157A, 160A } Romano, Giulio.
161, 163, 166 } Titian.
167. Moroni.
169. Bordone.
174. Palma Vecchio.
182. Lotto.
183. Palma Vecchio.
185, 188 } Cariani.
191. Bordone.
193, 193A } Moroni.
197. Moretto.
197A, 197B } Palma Vecchio.
204. Piero di Cosimo.
207. Boltraffio.
210A. Marco d'Oggiono.
213. Gaudenzio Ferrari.
218. Correggio.
222. Melzi.

225. Solario.
240. Sarto, A. del.
243. Garofalo.
245A. Franciabigio.
246. Sarto, A. del.
247A, 248 } Raphael.
249. Bartolommeo, Fra.
259B. Sebastiano del Piombo.
283. Bugiardini.
287. Francia, Giacomo
298, 298A, 299, 300 } Tintoretto.
301. Titian.
307, 307A } Savoldo.
309. Veronese, P.
310, 316 } Tintoretto.
320, 323, 325 } Lotto.
326, 330 } Veronese, P.
338B. Bronzino.
380B. Feti.
404A, 404C } Zurbaran.
405B. Ribera.
406B. Coello, Sanchez.
407. Carreño di Miranda.
408C. Spanish School.
413A, 413C, 413E, 413F } Velasquez.
414. Murillo.
414B. Cano.
414C. Murillo.
448B. Claude Lorraine.
459B, 459C } Tiepolo.
501E. Guardi.
512–523 } Van Eyck, Jan and Hubert.
523A. Van Eyck, Jan
523B. Christus, P.
525A, 525C, 525F, 525G } Van Eyck, Jan.
526A. Netherland School.
527. Daret.
528B, 529 } Memling.
529A, 529B } Christus.
529C, 529D } Memling.
529E, 529F, 532 } Christus.
532A. Ouwater.
533, 533A, 533B } Bouts.
534A, 534B, 534C, 535 } Weyden.
538A. Master of Flémalle.
538B. Netherland School.
539. Bouts.
545. Weyden.

545B, 545C } Bouts.
545D. Weyden.
551A. Gossart.
554. Isenbrant.
556. Amberger.
557D, 557E, 557F, 557G } Dürer.
559A. Cranach the Elder.
561. Metsys.
564, 564A, 567, 567A, 567B } Cranach the Elder.
569, 572 } Burgkmair.
573, 573A } David.
574A. Leyden.
574C. Metsys.
575, 575A, 575B } Master of Frankfort.
578. Cleve, Juste van.
583. Amberger.
583A. Strigel.
584A, 584B } Leyden.
586, 586B, 586D } Holbein the Younger.
588. Bruyn.
589, 593 } Cranach the Elder.
596A. Kulmbach.
597A. Breu.
603, 603A } Baldung.
607. Cornelisz van Oostsanen.
608. Patinir.
609. Engelbrechtsen.
615. Cleve, Juste van.
618. Cranach the Elder.
624. Bles.
630B, 630C } Netherland School.
633B. Cleve the Younger.
638, 638B, 638C, 638D, 638E } Altdorfer.
644A. Scorel.
648, 650 } Gossart.
719. Aertsen.
750, 750B, 750C } Keyser.
762, 762A, 762B, 762C, 763A, 763B } Rubens.
766. Hals.
770. Dyck, Van.
774, 776A, 776B, 776C } Rubens.
778. Dyck, Van.

781. Rubens.
782, 782A, 782B, 782C } Dyck, Van.
783, 785 } Rubens.
787A. Dyck, Van.
791, 791A, 791B, 791D, 791E, 791F, 791G, 791H } Terborch.
792C. Metsu.
795B, 795C, 795D } Steen.
798H. Rubens.
799. Dyck, Van.
800, 801A, 801C, 801F, 801G, 801H } Hals.
802, 806 } Rembrandt.
806B. Seghers.
806D. Gelder.
808. Rembrandt.
808A. Seghers.
809A. Bol.
810. Rembrandt.
810A. Vermeer of Delft.
811, 811A, 811C, 812, 812A } Rembrandt.
813B. Flinck.
819C. Maes.
820. Eeckhout.
820B. Hooch, P. de.
821A. Koninck.
823. Rembrandt.
825. Heerschop.
825A. Helst, van der.
828, 828A, 828B, 828C, 828D, 828E, 828F, 828H, 828J, 828L, 828M, 828N } Rembrandt.
832. Vos, C. de.
832A. Porcellis.
845D. Ostade, Isaac van.
847. Dou.
853A, 853H } Brouwer.
861. Cuyp.
865E. Goyen, Van.
872A. Potter.
875A. Cappelle.
884B, 885, 885G } Ruisdael, J. van.
886. Hobbema.

901c. Ruysdael, S. van.
912b, 912c } Vermeer of Delft.
960b. Molyn.
985a. Claez.
1006. Stoop.
1058. Vivarini, Ant.
1064, 1064a } Daddi, Bern.
1070a. Simone Martini.
1074a. Giotto.
1076. Allegretto Nuzi.
1077. Lorenzetti.
1079. Gaddi.
1081a. Lippo Memmi.
1124, 1128 } Botticelli.
1129a. Palmezzano
1132, 1133 } Sellajo.
1142. Sienese School.
1143. Vivarini, Workshop of Bart.
1144. Padua, School of.
1147. Ferrari, Defendente.
1156, 1156a } Crivelli, Carlo.
1160. Vivarini, Bart.
1162. Schiavone.
1165. Vivarini, Alvise.
1166. Pennacchi.
1170. Zoppo.
1170a. Vivarini, School of.
1170b, 1170c } Tura.
1175. Ferrarese School.
1177, 1177a } Bellini, Giovanni.
1180. Bellini, Gentile.
1182. Bianchi.
1234b. Schaffner.
1401a, 1401b } Hooch, P. de.
1614. Domenico Veneziano.
1616. Boccati.
1617. Foucquet.
1622a. Goes, Van der.
1629. Schongauer.
1631. Geertgen tot St. Jans.
1635. Ugolino da Siena.
1640. Backer.
1643. Corneille de Lyon.
1645, 1645a } Marmion.
1647a. Bosch.
1651. Pesellino.
1656. Witz.
1664. Bartolommeo Veneziano.
1673. Swabian School.
1700. Lippi, Fra Filippo.
1704. Master of St. Aegidius.
N. N. Rembrandt.
N. N. Tiepolo.
N. N. Bellini, Jacopo.

ROYAL GALLERY, DRESDEN

NOTE ON THE DRESDEN GALLERY

This gallery has been famous for many years not only because Dresden is a handsome city and attracts many strangers but because the gallery itself has some world-famous pictures upon its walls. One masterpiece alone—the Sistine Madonna by Raphael—has drawn thousands of tourists to Dresden. It is badly placed in a small room and much distorted by sidelights for which it was never intended, but still there is always an admiring throng before it. It is, perhaps, the most celebrated picture in existence.

When Augustus III (1733–63) came to power and began additions to the royal collection at Dresden it was the fashion of the day to admire only the mature Italian masters of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Names were in demand then as now, and so it happened that Augustus and his successor managed to pick up a large number of celebrated canvases by painters of renown in the art world. They are now in the Dresden Gallery, with many others of later acquisition, and they represent the late Italians very well. The early Italians were not seriously considered then, but in more recent years the deficiency has been measurably supplied, and now there are some rare examples of Antonello da Messina, Jacopo de' Barbari, Bartolommeo

Veneto, Cima, Cossa, Francia, Mantegna, and others. But the large canvases of the Venetians seem still the most attractive features. The splendid Cuccina pictures by Paolo Veronese, the three superb Palma Vecchios, the wonderful Venus of Giorgione, the well-preserved Tribute Money of Titian, the Lottos, the Tintorettos make up a remarkable chorus—a famous group than which nothing in European galleries is much finer. Not less important are the four large altar-pieces by Correggio with the widely known Holy Night among them. Not outside of Parma can one see Correggio so well represented as here. Here, too, are some men of the Ferrarese School rarely well seen in the northern galleries—Dosso Dossi, Girolamo da Carpi, Garofalo. The Italians make themselves felt at Dresden.

Of course the German painters were never neglected. There are large and excellent examples here by the Elder Cranach—better than in almost any other German gallery—the pathetic Christ on the Cross by Dürer, the Morett the Goldsmith by Holbein, besides many examples of less well-known men. And the Dutchmen seemed always desirable. There are sixteen pictures put down to Rembrandt, and among them is the splendid Manoah's Prayer. Nothing could be more jewel-like in colour or profound in emotional feeling than this picture. There are Bols, Eeckhouts, Flincks, that follow Rembrandt, a dozen or more Ruisdaels—some of them of the best quality—some fine

Terborchs, Steens, and Ostades, the superb Girl at a Window by Vermeer of Delft, and a great number of the smaller Dutchmen such as Metsu, Mieris, Dou, Wouwerman. Rubens is here in sixteen pictures, Jordaens in six, Van Dyck in twenty-six. All of these examples are not of the highest rank, and some of them are questionable in the matter of their attribution, but out of them all one gets a few canvases of great worth and excellence. The French School, beginning with Claude and Poussin, is, perhaps, better seen here than anywhere outside of Paris. These French pictures are shown in the east wing of the gallery, across the arched roadway. With them is a roomful of French portraits in pastel that should be looked at. On the top floor of the gallery is an interesting collection of modern pictures.

The building in which the pictures are kept is decidedly picturesque in external appearance, and is fairly well fitted for a gallery. It is properly lighted but usually ill ventilated, especially during the summer months. The rooms have high ceilings and occasionally pictures get "skied," but the hanging is as satisfactory as circumstances will permit. The visitor should notice the fine old frames, especially those of the small Dutch pictures in the side cabinets.

The catalogue, in German, French, and English, is arranged by numbers and schools, which requires continual reference to the index. It is accurate and has critical value. The notes frequently give the diverse

attributions of the various pictures with candour. There is an evident attempt to get at the truth whether it favours the official opinion or not. Hanfstaengl has reproduced in book form the chief pictures of the gallery, and besides these one can get good photographs at the door.

THE DRESDEN GALLERY

7. **Angelico, School of Fra.** ***Annunciation.*** A small and feebly drawn picture (look at the hands), but with a rich effect of gold work and colour.

52. * **Antonello da Messina.** ***St. Sebastian.*** An unusually large example of Antonello with Venetian influence very apparent in it. He was never in the Netherlands, never a pupil of Jan van Eyck, as Vasari says, but he certainly knew the Flemish method of working in oils, and probably got it from Flemish painters working in Italy. He brought this method to Venice, and no doubt had his influence on the Bellinis and was in turn influenced by them. This picture shows in its architecture, chimney-pots, rugs the Gentile Bellini influence. It is an excellent picture. Those who do not care for St. Sebastians might get some pleasure out of the colour and the architecture or even the chimney-pots or the little landscape with figures. Notice the foreshortened St. Christopher (?) lying at the left, and notice above him and all through this picture the effect of light coming from the blue sky and casting luminous shadows—under the arches, for instance. Unfortunately, somewhat hurt by repainting.

80. **Bacchiacca, Francesco Ubertini.** ***The Story of the King's Sons.*** The picture-story is told with some spirit and a good deal of bad drawing. No-

tice at the right the king's body and arms, how badly drawn they are, or the nude hanging figure. Everywhere the hands are poorly done. Formerly put down as a St. Sebastian by Franciabigio—Bacchiacca's master. It has the blue-green colour of Bacchiacca. Notice the companion piece, No. 75, for better work done by Franciabigio.

1587. **Backer, Jacob Adriaenz.** ***Bust of a Young Man in a Red Cloak.*** A good portrait by Backer though it once passed under the name of Koninck. Being something of a Rembrandt imitator, his works were formerly attributed to Rembrandt, and some of them are no doubt still under Rembrandt's name. Notice that the subject of this portrait looks a little like the so-called Rembrandt portraits, so much so that it might be mistaken for one of them.

113. **Bagnacavallo, Bartolommeo Ramenghi.** ***Madonna with Four Saints.*** It is a masterwork of this painter. Very like Dossi in its types, composition, dark shadows, and rich reds, greens, and blues. The draperies are broadly done and the painting shows some dexterity.

59A. **Barbari, Jacopo de' (Jacob Walch).** ***Galatea.*** A sad but rather powerful Galatea. It shows German influence and has a suggestion of Baldung about it. The type is more Germanic than Italian as one may see even in the feet. The outline drawing and colour are excellent. Notice the sea and the study of the waves. Notice also the loop of the brown drapery, how it accents the roundness of the figure. The picture has been restored but still has grace, charm, spirit. Nos. 57, 58, 59, assigned to this painter, are slight works.

108. **Baroccio, Federigo.** ***Ascension of Madonna.*** Warm in colour and freely handled, with something in the colour suggestive of Andrea del Sarto. Not a bad picture for a decadent.

107. ——***Hagar and Ishmael.*** Showing the influence of Correggio upon Baroccio. The head of Hagar is that of Correggio's Zingarella at Naples, as the catalogue points out. The colour and air and light of the picture are very good. And how nicely it is painted!

201A. * **Bartolommeo Veneto (Veneziano).** ***Daughter of Herodias.*** The work of a north-Italian painter (probably Bartolommeo Veneto) and apparently showing some influence from German painting. It looks very much like the white portrait (No. 13) at the Staedel Institute, Frankfort, which shows an even greater German influence. The green robe with the red cuffs and the minute work on the hair, dress borders, chain, and charger all indicate an Italian swayed by the northern manner. The historians of art, however, only allow of his being influenced from Milan or Cremona. A very interesting picture with an individuality about it (even in its oddity or awkwardness) that has outlived many more conventional works. How fine it is in its greens and reds!

283. **Bassano, Leandro.** ***Portrait of a Man Writing.*** It fills the space about the window with the figure, very much as the portrait (No. 1127) at Munich, ascribed to Tintoretto but really by a Bassano. There is nothing of inspiration in this work but much of good substantial portraiture.

281 } ——***The Doge Grimani and His Wife.*** The
282 } woman's portrait (No. 282) is the finer of the two

in colour and general decorative quality. The same way of disposing the figure about the window shows in these pictures as in No. 283, though this was not a peculiarity sacred to the Bassano family.

252A. **Bassano, Jacopo.** ***Samson and the Philistines.*** This picture has had its day as a Giulio Romano, and again as a Bordone. Now it is put down by Frizzoni as an early Jacopo Bassano. It has some earmarks peculiar to Bassano, but it is also like his master, Bonifazio. A good piece of colour, though the picture has been much repainted.

53. **Bellini, School of Giovanni.** ***The Doge Loredano.*** Probably, as Morelli insisted, a variation of the Doge Loredano in the National Gallery, London. The face is hard, leathery, almost impossible, but the robe is fairly well done, and there is a charming little view through the window of a Venetian island and lagoon. Other versions are in the Bergamo Gallery (No. 398) and the Correr Museum, Venice.

604. **Bellotto, Bernardo.** ***Verona.*** There are many Bellottos in this gallery, but the larger part of them are not good in quality and are perfunctory in execution. The best pictures by this artist are to be seen in the Vienna Gallery, where they give one's preconceived notions of Bellotto a violent jar.

831. **Beuckelaer, Joachim.** ***The Four Evangelists.*** There is some strong drawing here, as one may see by the hands and faces; but this painter has a brutal strain in his work that counts better with still-life and peasants for subjects than with evangelists. The types are strong but not very refined. The architecture at the back is crowded.

68. **Bevilacqua, Ambrogio.** ***Madonna Adoring Child.***
* A lovely picture, pure in sentiment and charming in colour. The garden is formal, but the landscape back of it is free and spacious. Notice the angels above; also the churches or castles at right and left on the mountain tops. The pose of the Madonna has something of the look of Francia's Madonna of the Rose Trellis at Munich (No. 1039). Done in distemper. It has a flat surface—dull but pleasing.

603. **Bol, Ferdinand.** ***The Rest in Egypt.*** To be compared with the Holy Family (No. 324) in the Munich Gallery, put down to Rembrandt. This is the weaker picture, but it suggests the Munich picture in types, colour, drawing, and composition. Faded out in colour and pallid in the flesh. The composition is pyramidal. The still-life is fairly well done, though everything is soft in substance.

1604. ——***Jacob's Dream.*** The angel is good in pose and nicely painted in the wings, but rather weak in the face. It might be compared with the same subject hanging near by—No. 1618A, by Eeckhout—which is still weaker. Both pictures probably came out of the same studio, No. 1618A evidently having been done by a poorer painter following the painter of No. 1604. The angel is Bol's angel in both pictures.

1605. ——***Jacob before Pharaoh.*** The head-dresses and portions of the garments are reminders of Rembrandt, but the heads and faces are much weaker than Rembrandt. It is a good picture. The Joseph is the same model as in the pictures No. 809A at Berlin, ascribed to Bol, and No. 828, ascribed to Rembrandt. Compare it with No.

1600 here, put down to Flinck. The colour is good but pallid, and now yellowed by varnish. The picture is injured at the top.

1606. ——*Portrait of a Young Man Wearing a Hat.* Notice the Rembrandtesque quality of this Bol in its light, shade, golden-grey tone, costume, colour. It is soft in modelling and lacks accent; but Bol was not always so weak, and sometimes painted pictures now confused with those of his master, Rembrandt. Compare this with the work in the Hunter with the Bittern, by Rembrandt (No. 1561).

208. **Bonifazio dei Pitati.** *Finding of Moses.* Several pictures in this gallery attributed to Bonifazio are good in their schemes of colour, if loose and uncertain in their drawing. The painter is seen at his best in the Venice Academy. Morelli insisted that there were three of this name, but modern criticism has settled down to one, Bonifazio dei Pitati—the others being merely hooks upon which to hang the works of followers and imitators. This work is carelessly done, but rich in colour and with a broad landscape. An arched group of figures with outlets at the sides into the background.

204. **Bordone, Paris.** *Diana Hunting.* It hangs high on the wall and looks much repainted. Notice the coarse quality of the hair and the hard landscape, especially in the foliage. The dogs are good. The colour is cold and the drawing poor.

203. ——*Apollo between Marsyas and Midas.* A characteristic Bordone half-length, but apparently in better condition than usual, or else painted with greater care.

205. ——*Holy Family and St. Jerome.* An odd picture for Bordone. The St. Joseph is much hurt

and changed in colour. The landscape is like that of a Bonifazio.

8. **Botticelli, Sandro.** ***Madonna, Child, and St. John.*** It has all the Botticelli earmarks, but not his spirit or quality. It is probably a workshop piece.

9. ——***Life of St. Zenobius.*** A panoramic picture that gives one a very faint idea of Botticelli. The filling of the panel with groups of small figures was an unhappy thought, for it produces a scattered effect which, for all the central group and the lines leading up to it from the left, holds throughout the picture. The action is excited, the drapery uneasy, the architecture rectangular and uncompromising. The colour is rather monotonous in red; the landscape is very good. It is one of a series another panel of which is in the Metropolitan Museum of New York. By no means a representative Botticelli though genuine enough.

1888. **Breu, Georg.** ***The St. Ursula Altar-Piece.*** Harsh and rather repellent art, but very true and honest work, and (in the side panels) very decorative. Notice the panel at the left with its fine colour and good landscape. The central panel has too much in it. Formerly the work passed as a Burgkmair.

1058 } **Brouwer, Adriaen.** ***Peasants Quarrelling.*** Ex-
1059 } cellent pictures from a painter's point of view. No. 1058 is fine in breadth of handling and in colour. Notice the setting of the room in No. 1059. It is not so well painted nor so good in colour as No. 1058.

892. **Brueghel the Elder, Jan** (Velvet). ***Windmill.*** There are a large number of small Brueghels in

this gallery, some of them (as Nos. 891, 886, and 889) very picturesque in brightly coloured figures, wagons, horses, and landscapes. They are pictures that can be lived with.

21. **Capponi (or Carli), Raffaele dei.** ***Madonna, Child, and Saint.*** It has no great strength, but in its place a half-Umbrian sentiment. The Madonna is inclined to be merely pretty, but the picture is pleasing. The painter is not identical with Raffaelino del Garbo, according to Berenson. There is dispute about identities just here.

Carli. See Capponi.

64A. **Catena, Vincenzo.** ***Madonna with St. Peter and St. Helena.*** It is crude, even for Catena, as notice the work on the hair or the drawing of the heads. It is probably a school copy.

Cavazzola. See Morando, Paolo.

61. **Cima, Giovanni Battista.** ***The Saviour.*** Christ standing with the book in his left hand, and back of him a characteristic Cima landscape. The head of Christ is fine, the drapery a little hard but falling free, the colour excellent, the handling rather broad for Cima.

63. * ——***Presentation of Mary in the Temple.*** A picture that Titian may possibly have seen before painting his Presentation in the Venice Academy (No. 626). Notice the similarity in the compositions, even including the old market woman with the basket of eggs. In colour and architecture Cima's picture is Venetian; in costume it is suggestive of Constantinople and the East. The Virgin is very naïve, as is also the boy seated on the lower steps. The hills are a bit too blue and have not

the beauty of Titian's mountains. But it is a good Cima.

730. * **Claude Lorraine.** ***Flight into Egypt.*** A large, ideal landscape with lofty trees, flowing water, distant hills, and high sky with flaky clouds. It is cool in light and colour save at the horizon, very classic in feeling, imposing by its linear and aerial perspective. It represents Claude rightly, although not free from immaturities of technique, and a somewhat formal composition. The buildings in the middle distance show well.

731. * ——***Acis and Galatea.*** Another fine example of Claude, showing a sunset sky across a sea with a rocky coast at the right. It is quite as fine in its way as No. 730, except in the sky. The figures in both pictures are merely foreground spots of colour that serve to give the names to the pictures. They were probably painted by another hand than Claude's. A very good study of water. The trees are somewhat grandiloquent and the clouds are hard-edged. But for its time this is imposing and impressive landscape work.

809. **Cleve, Juste van der Beke van (Master of the Death of the Virgin).** ***Adoration of the Magi.*** The smaller example here is just as interesting as the larger one (No. 809A). It is crowded in composition, but full of interesting detail in types, columns, robes, landscape. Somewhat cleaned in the faces. Attributed to Lucas van Leyden, Gossart, and others.

809A. ——***Adoration of Magi.*** A large composition with many figures. The types are strong; the people are sincere. There is some uneasiness in the red and blue robes with much beauty of pat-

tern in the brocade at left. The landscapes at the right and left are interesting. The small detail in the foreground serves to fill up without adding to the value of the picture though done with the skill of a goldsmith. This painter's work is confused with that of other painters of his time and is assigned more or less tentatively.

150. * **Correggio, Antonio Allegri da.** ***Madonna of St. Francis.*** An early Correggio, done probably before he was twenty, and suggestive of his early influences. His masters and teachers are unknown or at least shadowy; but this early picture shows the influence of Leonardo da Vinci in the type of the Madonna, in the smile, the heavy eyelid, nose, chin, face, contours, shadows. Her foreshortened hand is like that of Leonardo's Madonna of the Rocks (Louvre, No. 1599) and also like that of Mantegna's Madonna of Victory (Louvre, No. 1374). The type of face of St. John is also Leonardesque. St. Catherine and St. Francis are reminders of Francia or Costa. The colour is slightly suggestive of Garofalo, while the white medallion speaks for the Ferrarese. But all these reminiscences fade out in Correggio's later works. This picture is a pyramidal composition framed by Ionic columns at the side. The Madonna is heavy in the knees and hips; the foreshortening of the figure is not perfect. The drapery is wonderfully free for a boy-painter and the colour is pleasing if not great. The lower part of the picture is repainted (for instance, in the supporting cupids or putti); the sky back of the angel heads is also gone, and the modelling of the hands has been hurt. Cleaned too much and injured all through, but still attractive. Notice the Correggio spirit of joy-

ousness so early apparent in the little angels and the ecstatic saints.

151. ——***Madonna of St. Sebastian.*** In bad condition and very much repainted. Since Correggio's death no fewer than five different restorers have been painting upon it. Evidently bitumen or something akin to it was used in the shadows (as also in the column shadows of No. 150) and this has blackened it much. As an example of the repainting, notice the face of the St. Roch sleeping at the right. None of the Correggio surface remains, but in a general way it has his drawing, composition, and colour. The sentiment is also more or less his and is a trifle overdone. The Madonna is merely pretty and the supporting angels are affected. The St. Sebastian is perhaps too ecstatic. The most natural and naïve figure of the group is that of the little angel astride of the cloud at the right of the centre. A pyramidal composition but not a restful one—not even in the St. Roch, who sleeps in a position as impossible as that of the Antiope in the Louvre (No. 1118).

152. ** ——***The Holy Night.*** It was a technical peculiarity of Correggio that he centralised his light and surrounded it with darks as a relief and a foil. Here his method of handling light and dark exactly fitted the incident he was called upon to narrate. The Child in the Manger is shown as the Light of the World. All the light emanates from him. It strikes the face of the Madonna, illumines the shepherds, and lights up the clouds and angels above. Once a beautiful picture but now injured by flayings of the surface and repaintings. Still lovely as a pattern of light and shade and beauti-

ful in the graceful legs of the flying angels at the top. The colour in the angels is fine but that of the central figures is perhaps too cool. The dawn is just apparent along the distant horizon. No doubt this was originally the best of the four large pictures here, but all of them have been much changed by the warping and splitting of the panels and the necessary repainting that followed.

153. * ——*Madonna of St. George.* A little lumpy in the figures, and somewhat huddled in the composition. Again a pyramidal, balanced composition with saints supporting the Madonna on either side. The Madonna's figure as seated is almost impossible. She is telescoped. St. John at left and the Cupids in the foreground are heavy and fleshy. St. George stands badly, and the saint back of him has affectation written in his hands. The arabesque of fruit at the top seems to count for little. In colour, perhaps, the most attractive of the four large Correggios. The picture has been repainted, but is apparently in better condition than the others.

154. ——*Magdalen.* Put down as an "apparent" Correggio. Morelli, in 1880, rather damaged it as a Correggio by pointing out that it was painted on copper—a material not used by the Italian painters until long after Correggio's time but much used by painters in the Netherlands. Morelli called it a Netherland copy of a lost Correggio. The wonder is that with its prettiness, its porcelain surface, its manicured finger-nails, and its petty details it could ever have been put down to Correggio at any time. It shows nothing of his manner and is probably a seventeenth-century original that came from the Netherlands.

155. ——*Portrait of a Scholar.* Given by Morelli to Dossi and in the catalogue only tentatively to Correggio. A fairly good portrait but it has suffered from cleaning and repainting. It is a work difficult to assign with any certainty to any painter.

43. * **Cossa, Francesco del.** *The Annunciation.* An early and very good work of this rare Ferrarese painter. It is somewhat crude in colour and harsh in drawing. The Madonna type is short in stature, with uneasy drapery probably studied from sculpture and suggesting the influence of Mantegna. The picture is also Paduan in the head and hair and drapery of the angel. The Renaissance architecture is particularly fine though obtrusive and the central column divides the composition and makes two distinct pictures with two points of sight. Notice how beautifully and naïvely the background scenes are given.

1906G, 1906H * **Cranach the Elder, Lucas.** *Portraits of the Duke Henry and the Duchess Katherina.* With much gilding to show the gold of the brocades. Perhaps the pictures are too large for the use of gold. In any event, they seem to have been regilded and are now too bright. The effect is overornate. The flat figures and angular drawing give a grotesque look in which even the dogs join, but the pictures are very considerable works of art for all their oddity. How exceedingly decorative the dress of the Duchess!

1906E, 1906F ——*St. Catherine and St. Barbara.* These figures were done more than once by Cranach. It is questioned whether the panels here are by his own hand or are school pieces, but in either case they are very decorative, graceful, and charming

figures, beautiful in their robes and crowns, and lovely in colour.

1915. ——***Duke Henry.*** Again the attribution is questioned, but what a picture to hang in a baronial hall! Here it looks odd and out of place. Cranach's conceptions seem peculiarly ill fitted to show in a gallery. They have a quality that seems to require isolation for appreciation. Considered by itself, this archaic presentation with its coat of arms and inscription in gold is excellent.

1914. ——***Ecce Homo.*** Piteous in the sentiment of it. The drawing is a little rambling, as notice the hands. The colour in the putti is merely indicated. What charming putti!

1916A. * ——***Adam and Eve.*** Like No. 1916, it is excellent in outline drawing. And how very sincere in the thinking and feeling as well as the drawing! What decorative panels in colour! Notice the foliage, the fruit, and the sky. Other versions elsewhere. See also the repetitions Nos. 1911–1912.

1908. ——***Christ on the Mount.*** This picture, with No. 1907, does not show Cranach's drawing or colour to advantage. The trees against the sky make a good pattern, but even this is not up to his best work.

1913. ——***Christiana Eulenau.*** It is probably a workshop picture but is rather fine in type as well as clever in the manner of its execution.

1917. ——***A Nude Child.*** How very naïve! It is just as charming for the north as Carpaccio's children for Italy. And how beautifully drawn in outline! There are a large number of Cranachs at Dresden. He lived and died at Wittenberg, near here, which

may account for the size of the collection. Some of the pictures, however, are school pieces.

1952. **Cranach the Elder, Lucas (School of).** ***Melanchthon on his Death-Bed.*** It is interesting not only for the likeness of the great reformer but also as a lovely study in whites. Notice how well the values of the different whites are maintained. Notice also the drawing of the hair and the beard. See the portrait of Luther (No. 1918) and also the living Melanchthon (No. 1919).

1946. **Cranach the Younger, Lucas.** ***Crucifixion.*** It is a rather weak picture but interesting for its red scheme of colour. Notice that even the sky seems to run blood-red.

13. **Credi, Lorenzo di.** ***Madonna and Child with Infant St. John.*** It seems a little warm in colouring for Lorenzo di Credi and has a Flemish look about its smooth surfaces and textures, especially in the Madonna's sleeve. The landscape seen through the window is also Flemish-looking. But these are superficial resemblances, perhaps. Not a great picture, but not without charm. It has had a varied experience among the experts, as the catalogue note records. It is certainly by the painter of the Madonna and Child (No. 1043A) in the Munich Gallery, there ascribed to Leonardo da Vinci but possibly by some one in Verrocchio's studio.

14. ——***Holy Family.*** This is, perhaps, nearer the usual manner of Lorenzo di Credi than No. 13 and has much that suggests his cold blues, greys, and greens. The flesh-notes are pasty and wanting in colour, the outline drawing severe, the types of faces and figures, with the landscape, characteristic, but

the whole work lacks in the quality of its drawing and handling, and is probably by some follower of Lorenzo.

15. ——***Madonna with Saints.*** As the catalogue says, a hard, cold picture in the late period of the master. It has nothing to commend it in colour and little in drawing or composition. A formal, commonplace picture with chilly blues and greens.

1782. **Cuyp, Aelbert.** ***Boy and Dog.*** Much admired by the passing throng but it is too smooth and pretty. The boy is badly drawn and the dog badly painted. Notice the boy's arms and hands. His head is too large for his body. The picture is hardly clever enough for Cuyp.

509. **Dolci, Carlo.** ***St. Cecilia.*** The smooth-faced saint is pictured with boneless hands and dropsical fingers playing at an organ. The sentiment of it is about the cheapest produced by the Decadence. Yet it is much admired. See also No. 508 or No. 510 for the same affected elegance.

124. **Dosso Dossi (Giovanni Lutero).** ***St. George.*** A picture attributed to Dosso Dossi by Morelli and to Girolamo da Carpi by Berenson. Possibly inspired by the Raphael St. George in the Hermitage, as the catalogue suggests. Dark in tone, with an exaggerated lighting derived indirectly from Giorgione. Compare the light-smitten landscape and city in the background with that in the Carpis near to it (Nos. 142 and 144) and also with the Dosso Dossi (No. 126). St. George is a fine type, clad in beautiful armour, and the princess is fine in colour. An interesting picture somewhat blackened and also repainted in parts.

125. ——*St. Michael.* It is after the large Raphael (ascribed) in the Louvre—St. Michael and the Dragon. Like the original, it is a little theatrical. Dark in tone.

126. ——*Justice.* This is apparently a genuine, if not a very good Dosso Dossi. The figure is a little heavy and the drawing of the eyes, nose, and hands hard. The greens and reds are effective. The landscape is interesting.

127. ——*Peace.* Evidently a companion piece to No. 126 but perhaps not entirely by the same hand. Compare the drawing and colouring, the left hand, and the feet with those in No. 126. The figure is lumpy, like a Salviati, and the drawing is hard. It is a weaker picture than No. 126.

128. ——*Vision of Four Church Fathers.* A double composition. The upper part makes a separate picture. The lower angels in the clouds at the left (intended to bind the two parts together) are graceful but out of key. Not a very successful composition as a whole. There is a light-smitten city at the back, as in No. 124, and some good colour. See also No. 129.

131. **Dossi (School of).** *The Dream.* Possibly by Dosso Dossi but weird in theme and crude in painting. The figure of the dreamer is not unlike this painter's type. It is rather heavy.

1704. **Dou, Gerard.** *Portrait of the Painter in His Studio.* In Dou's small manner, with a carefully detailed inventory of all his belongings, given with every dot and dash correctly placed with wearisome and hopeless exactness. Nos. 1717 and 1719 are much better examples. Nos. 1716 and 1717 in

subject and style should be carried in mind to the Louvre at Paris and compared with the so-called Rembrandt there (No. 2541A).

1720. ——***Woman Reading.*** Here is Dou in his Rembrandtesque manner, with the same pose, drawing, handling, and colour that we frequently see in the "early Rembrandts" of so many European galleries.

1869. **Dürer, Albrecht.** ***The Dresden Altar-Piece.*** Done
* in tempera on linen, which gives it its lustreless, grey look. Somewhat stained also and much restored. It has decisive drawing still, is full of feeling in the Madonna, and is lovely in such details as the little angels with the crown, the small ones sweeping the floor, the carpenter shop at the left, the landscape at the right. In its present state, what fine decorative colour it has! The St. Sebastian and St. Anthony in the wings are less interesting though extremely well done and better preserved than the centre-piece.

1870. ——***Christ on the Cross.*** One of the most pathetic
* figures in art. The picture is in the same class with Rembrandt's Supper at Emmaus in its emotional significance. The figure of Christ hanging there quite alone and deserted, the dark sky overhead, the serene landscape at the back, as though to symbolise the listlessness of nature or the world, are distinctly impressive. This is an early conception. Rubens treated it later with more maturity of thought and brush, expressing the conception more completely but with less feeling and pathos (No. 748 in the Munich Gallery). The figure here is slight but beautifully placed in relationship to the dark sky and emphasised by the white

cloth. Dürer repeated the figure in his Trinity at Vienna (No. 1145).

1871. ——***Portrait of Barent van Orley.*** It is a little formal and perfunctory. The shadows are dirty and (in the neck) false. The drawing of the outline rambles somewhat. A late picture and not Dürer's best.

840. **Dutch School.** ***Holy Family.*** Not a picture of the first rank or quality but an early Flemish (?) work of some sentiment, colour, and good craftsmanship. The back of the room is well given but the drawing in the hands and draperies is lax and uncertain.

846. ——***Portrait of a Woman.*** An excellent characterisation, fine in type, fairly well drawn, and simple in treatment. Formerly thought to be in "the manner of Holbein," which is perhaps nearer the mark than its present attribution. It is German, not Dutch.

1017. **Dyck, Anthony van.** ***The Drunken Silenus.*** It shows a following of Rubens and not a very good one either. It is hot in colour and badly flayed by cleanings. The figure at the extreme left is almost destroyed—notice the face and wretched handling of the hair. A similar picture is in the Brussels Gallery. Both of them follow Rubens's Bacchanal at Munich (No. 754), with variations and additions.

1018–1021A ——***Apostles.*** Study heads, like Rubens in style, and probably done in the Rubens studio. If by Van Dyck they are early work. They are well done—that is, well drawn and painted, but rather hot in flesh-notes. Others of the series are seen at the Louvre and Hermitage.

1022. ——***Portrait of an Old Man.*** This seems to be in the style of No. 960, put down to Rubens. They are both possibly by the same hand, but it should be insisted upon that the hand cannot be positively recognised as that of either Rubens or Van Dyck. It is good, rather hesitating portraiture which may favour the youthful Van Dyck authorship. The nose and eyes are Van Dyck's but the beard and ruff are like Rubens's work.

1023. ——***Portrait of an Old Lady.*** It is similar to No. 1022 and raises the same question of attribution. Again an excellent portrait, though heavily handled in the face and perhaps repainted.

1023A. * ——***Portrait of a Young Man.*** It is similar in style to No. 1023C but hotter in colour. The thin painting of the hair and neck with the drawing of the mouth and moustache and the colour are suggestive of Rubens; but the drawing of the eye shows Van Dyck. It is not wise to be arbitrary about assigning these peculiar portraits to either Rubens or Van Dyck. They are exactly like neither painter. There may be a third Rubens pupil, whose name we do not even know, who may have painted them. They are excellent portraits.

1023B. ——***Portrait of a Lady and Child.*** Probably a true-enough Van Dyck, but so much cleaned and repainted that it is about done for. At one time put down to Rubens, but it is a flayed Van Dyck—skinned down to the white high lights. Look at the wrecked curtain at the left. The hands and faces are nearly as badly off.

1023C, 1023D * ——***Portraits of a Man and a Woman.*** Excellent portraits in good condition. In the style of No. 960, attributed to Rubens, and with Rubens's red

shadows in the flesh; but enough like Van Dyck to make a positive attribution to either painter impossible. They are fine portraits. How easily they rest, and what strong characters they are! Cleaned but not repainted to any extent.

1030. ——***Portrait of a Man.*** Much cleaned and repainted. Look at the restorer's beard and moustache.

1033. ——***Children of Charles I.*** It is thin and weak. Probably an old copy of the Windsor Castle picture. At any rate, not entitled to very serious consideration.

1034. ——***Henrietta, Wife of Charles I.*** It is a copy or worse. Weak and thin all through, with a superficial elegance worthy of Lely. The figure is flat against the brocade at the back, and all the red ground comes forward. Notice also the flat, shadowless doing of the white lace. Then go back to the hard, white-china face.

1025. ——***The Child Jesus.*** It is in the pretty style of Van Dyck but possibly by some later imitator. Van Dyck did work less well drawn and heavier in handling than this, but he hardly attempted such things as the foreground discloses in the snake, the leaves, the flowers. That seems the work of a later Fleming.

1029. ——***Portrait of a Man.*** A palpable Van Dyck, and yet very different from Nos. 1023c and 1023d, put down to him in this gallery. Here he is simply the conventional Van Dyck doing a half-length with some skill but no fine feeling.

1027 } ——***Portraits of a Man and a Woman.*** These two
1028 } portraits have the unhappy apoplectic flesh that

belongs not so much to Van Dyck as to the last century's restorers. The pictures are hurt, especially the background in the portrait of the woman, in the ruffs and cuffs, and in the face. Van Dyck's mannered style shows here.

1035. ——***Portrait of a Man in Furs.*** There is no apparent reason for thinking it by Van Dyck. It is unlike him and is, perhaps, nearer to some German painter of the seventeenth century.

1024. * ——***St. Jerome.*** A picture that serves to emphasise the wide difference between Rubens and even his best pupil. Compare it with the Rubens St. Jerome (No. 955 on the same wall), of which it is a variation. Van Dyck was following his master as closely as he could; and yet, what a difference! Notice this difference in the drawing and also in the flesh colouring. Van Dyck is hot where Rubens is cool and serene. In the handling Van Dyck is bready, gummy, heavy where Rubens is fluent, flowing, certain to the last degree. Van Dyck put in the curtain at the top as an improvement on the Rubens, but it fails—it makes the composition restless. Notice, on the contrary, the serene feeling of peace in the Rubens—the sense of space there is about it. But both are notable pictures.

1618. **Eeckhout, Gerbrandt van den.** ***Presentation in the Temple.*** To be compared with No. 1931, by Poorter. Here is a stronger follower of Rembrandt, with little of Poorter's weakness and sweetness. Eeckhout is more confused with Rembrandt than any other of Rembrandt's pupils. He has been so bewilderingly confused by the various attributions of authorities that one has difficulty in identifying his work. It is usually coarse, strong,

ill-drawn work, with dark, blackish shadows and often spotty high lights. This picture formerly passed as a Rembrandt.

1618A. ——*Jacob's Dream.* The central angel is Bol's model. The painter of this picture borrowed from Bol all through. It is a poor following of No. 1604, ascribed to Bol. Apparently it has little of Eeckhout about it, though duly signed and dated.

843. **Engelbrechtsen, Cornelis.** ***Temptation of St. Anthony.*** A small, round picture in which the pattern of the figures and the trees fills the circle very well. Notice the graceful, Bles-like figure at the right with the long, flowing gown. The colour is attractive. Formerly listed as a Lucas van Leyden.

1835. * **Everdingen, Allart van.** ***Stag Hunt by a Mountain Lake.*** With a dark-clouded sky of some strength. A much better landscape than Everdingen usually painted and as good as a Hobbema or a Ruisdael. The figures are thought to have been painted by Berchem, but they add little to the general effect. The picture is dominated by the sky and air of the distance.

1838. ——***Water Mills.*** A good landscape, well held together, and fairly well painted. The sky and trees are a bit crude in their doing. See also No. 1837. It is of about the same quality.

799. * **Eyck, Jan van.** ***Altar-Piece.*** At first glance the most notable features of this picture are the lovely colours of the Madonna's robes and the magnificent baldacchino back of and above her. The church is excellent in the drawing of its columns, capitals, and the saints in niches above them, with the round gig-lamp window-panes back of the columns. This centre panel is supposed by Weale and others to be

by Hubert van Eyck. The wings are possibly by a later and different hand (so Weale surmises), but they match the central portion very well and are by no means to be overlooked. Notice, for instance, the angel at the left and the fine type of the donor kneeling below. In the opposite wing the blue robes of St. Catherine are perhaps too high in key. She wears a beautiful crown and has a charming little landscape back of her. See the catalogue note for the various attributions of this altar-piece. There are donors in grisaille on the outside of the wings.

1591. **Fabritius, Bernaert.** ***Portrait of a Woman.*** This portrait may suggest the possible painter of some of the black-shadowed, square-fingered pictures attributed to Rembrandt, notably No. 1568, in this gallery. Fabritius was a pupil of Rembrandt. His pictures are scarce because most of them are given to Rembrandt but there are fair examples of him at the Darmstadt Gallery.

223. **Farinato, Paolo.** ***Presentation in the Temple.*** In the style of Paolo Veronese but much slighter and weaker in every way. It is good in colour and interesting in pattern. It comes nearer to being a Zelotti than a Farinato, but that is no great matter. A fine decorative canvas.

249. **Fasolo, Giovanni Antonio.** ***Portrait of a Venetian.*** If we could see behind the veil of its repainting no one knows what surprise might be sprung upon us. Paolo Veronese's own hand might be there. But we shall not know more than that it once was a good picture.

149A. **Ferrarese School.** ***Deposition.*** A small panel in apparently good condition. There is sentiment

in the figures, although it is a little weak and leans toward sentimentality. The painter of it can only be guessed at. He is, perhaps, one of the many whose names have not come down to us.

808. **Flemish School (15th Century).** ***An Altar Wing with St. Elizabeth.*** Fine in colour, with a graceful figure, a gorgeous robe, and an excellent sky. The companion panel, No. 807, is not so interesting.

1600. **Flinck, Govaert.** ***Old Man with a Red Cap.*** It is a sketchy study and gives us small idea of Flinck as a Rembrandt follower—the thing about him in which we are, perhaps, the most interested. The handling here is free but not very sure, the colour a bit foxy, and the modelling an attempt at ruggedness given with some softness. There is a feeling that the head is wanting in depth—the suggestion of the right eye does not carry the conviction that there is a right side to the head. The same hand did the Head of a Turk (No. 325) at Munich, assigned to Rembrandt.

1602. ——***David Giving the Letter to Uriah.*** It is flashy, in the yellow robe as elsewhere, and shows a superficial following of Rembrandt methods. But it is suggestive of some Rembrandts the student meets with in the European galleries. It has, perhaps the same eye and hand behind it as the David and Saul (No. 621) at The Hague, the Christ before Pilate (No. 368) at Budapest, the Centurion Cornelius in the Wallace Collection, London (No. 86). Originally thought to be by Bol.

22. **Florentine School.** ***Madonna, Child, and St. John.*** The sentiment of it seems more Umbrian than Florentine, as also the figures of the children,

the hands, the flesh-notes, and possibly the landscape. Notice the beautiful head of St. John. Not strong but sincere work, and very good in colour. It has been variously attributed to Lorenzo di Credi, to followers of Botticelli and Filippino, to Umbrian painters, to Raffaelino del Garbo; but it is a pleasing picture with no name at all attached to it.

48. * **Francia, Francesco.** ***Baptism of Christ.*** The picture has been injured by repainting (see, for example, the ruined hand of the angel at the left) but still remains a fine example of Francia and a noble picture in spirit. It is a simple composition —a balanced arrangement of figures against a background amphitheatre of hills. The dip of the sky-line is repeated in the aureole of the dove and contrasted in the arch of the figures—the line carrying from St. John over the head of Christ to the angels at the left. Notice the well-drawn figure of Christ. The picture is much warmer in colour and light than is usual with Francia. The sentiment of the characters is excellent in the beseeching attitude of the St. John and the quiet submission of the Saviour. Notice that Christ stands *on* the water instead of *in* it—something that may interest theologians who follow the doctrine of immersion.

49. ——***Adoration of the Magi.*** A small picture in the mature period of the master. Brighter in colour and more enamel-like in surface than No. 48. A graceful, decorative panel but cold in the sky and distance.

75. **Franciabigio (Francesco Bigi).** ***Bathsheba.*** Compared with the companion piece by Bacchiacca

(Ubertini, No. 80), this is a better work in both drawing and colour and the architecture is much truer in tone. The bathing figures at the left are well drawn and graceful. And what life there is in the small figures on the balconies! The sky is lead-coloured. The whole picture is laid in with a large half-tone.

132–135 **Garofalo (Benvenuto Tisi).** ***Poseidon and Athena.*** Various small, dusky pictures but not very important ones. They have Garofalo's mannerisms, his shortcomings, and also much of his acceptable colour; but some of them are not above suspicion of being by Stefano Falzagalloni, a clever imitator of Garofalo.

140. ——***Jesus in the Temple.*** A picture with rich, warm colour. The arrangement of the figures is formal and balanced but one cares little about that or the drawing. The charm of the picture lies in its colour. It is an excellent Garofalo.

1791. **Gelder, Aert de.** ***Presentation of Christ.*** In its general effect a very good picture, but the effect is more Rembrandt's than Gelder's. He is following his master here, but at some distance. Fair in colour but rambling in the composition. It lacks concentration, the light is scattered, and the drawing is weak. Somewhat injured.

1792A. ——***An Important Document.*** The central figure of the woman is very good. The man at the right is sacrificed in colour and light—too much so for the need of the picture. But the general colour scheme is excellent. The attribution has been questioned. See the picture at Munich, No. 355, probably painted by the same hand.

1792. ——*A Halberd Bearer.* It has the coarse, hit-or-miss drawing of Gelder and some of his colour. A work of no great importance though it has good tone about it. Once attributed to Rembrandt.

1905. * **German School (15th Century).** *Portrait of a Man.* It is very fine. Look at the head and hands. Also the green dress. Possibly some Netherland influence shows here. It is thought by critics to be of Netherlandish origin, but the German of it seems marked. The light sky has probably been repainted and rendered a little out of tone.

185. *** **Giorgione (Giorgio Barbarelli).** *Sleeping Venus.* In many respects this is the pearl of the Dresden Gallery. Originally a superb figure by Giorgione with a landscape painted in after Giorgione's death by Titian, as the Anonimo tells us. A cupid was placed near the feet (probably by Titian again) but, long afterward, painted out. The spot where it was still shows through the overpainting. The landscape has the same buildings at the right that appear in Titian's Noli Me Tangere in the National Gallery, London. Unfortunately, the picture has been much repainted, and the quality of the linen under the figure, the flesh-colour, the landscape, and sky have been badly injured. But the beautiful lines of the figure are still there. Notice the long swing of the under line from the elbow to the foot and the wonderful delicacy of modelling that still shows in the figure. It should be compared with the nude figure in Titian's Sacred and Profane Love in the Borghese Gallery, Rome, one of the most beautiful of all nudes and very close in spirit and execution to this Giorgione Venus. The feet and legs of the fig-

ures are very much alike. Perhaps Titian painted on this figure, too—possibly altered or changed it somewhat. The Anonimo's statement is very brief. The Venus is nude but not naked, and is more refined than Botticelli's Venus in her sea-shell. Look at the face and notice the purity of it. The colour (especially the red) is not what it once was but is still pleasing. The landscape, too, has suffered but it is still broad and simple. Formerly regarded as a copy after Titian by Sassoferrato, until Morelli declared it by Giorgione.

186. **Giorgione** (after). ***The Horoscope.*** Giorgionesque in type and style but hard in outline and bad in drawing. Compare the statue in the niche with the Sleeping Venus (No. 185) in this gallery for form. Notice also the crude work in the white phœnix. It is a poor affair probably by Romanino. The Giorgione Paris and Shepherds (No. 145) at Budapest is painted by the same hand as this, also the two Giorgione landscapes in the Uffizi and the school piece, No. 1173, in the National Gallery, London. They are all by Romanino. Notice the mannerism of the narrow, cocked eyes which belongs to Romanino.

142. **Girolamo da Carpi.** ***Opportunity and Patience.*** The figure is not convincing as to its lightness or grace. The landscape follows Dossi as may be seen by comparison with Nos. 126 and 128. The canvas injured.

144. ——***Judith.*** The figure is heavy. At one time the picture was thought to be by Dossi. The landscape as in No. 142. Hurt by repainting.

1338A } **Goyen, Jan van.** ***Landscapes.*** Several of these
1338C } landscapes by Van Goyen, notably 1338A and

1338B, are charming in their grey-green monotone or their warm browns. His olive-green trees with their peculiar drawing of the foliage, his sky and water are always more or less mannered and were easily followed (though at a distance) by his pupil Salomon van Ruysdael. There is a fine tone about his pictures and a decorative feeling. They hold their place well on the wall.

276. **Greco, Il (Domenico Theotocopuli).** ***Healing the Blind.*** Not a remarkable work in any way, but probably by Il Greco. The Christ at the left, with the foreshortened head and the tall figure, shows the master in his early manner when he was taking an influence not so much from Titian or Tintoretto as from Leandro Bassano. This is apparent not only in types and drawing but in colours, especially in a certain apple-green peculiar to Leandro which Il Greco appropriated. The fact that this picture was long attributed to Leandro Bassano instead of to Il Greco points to the resemblances in their works.

601A. **Guardi, Francesco.** ***Pius VI Blessing the Venetians.*** A picture interesting in subject to those who know their Venice well. The painter took some liberties with his text, however. There are several versions of this same subject. It is doubtful that this is the original.

1158 } **Gysels, Pieter.** ***Landscape with Cattle.*** Very
1159 } attractive little pictures done in the style of Jan Brueghel the Elder whom Gysels followed.

1358. **Hals, Frans.** ***Portrait of a Man.*** Small in size but effective in its breadth and grasp. The figure is restful though the coat is not. It breaks in sharp angles. The surface is easily painted but

not precisely in the style of Hals. It is hardly Hals at his best and perhaps not the elder Hals at all. Dirck Hals painted just such figures in schemes of black, white, and grey.

1359. ——*Portrait of a Man.* It is not as certain in its drawing and handling as No. 1358 and might have been done by a pupil or follower of Hals. Notice the ruff, the hair, and the drawing of the face. Neither portrait gives us much idea of Frans Hals. He painted figures with more of the third dimension about them.

1371. **Heda, Willem Claesz.** *Still-Life.* In the matter of textures and surfaces, what could be more realistic than this? It is a surface art but of much skill and cleverness. As decoration, it counts for little.

1225. **Heem, Cornelis de.** *Still-Life.* A good piece of painting if somewhat shallow in its petty detail of snails and water-drops. But there never has been a time when the tear, the water-drop, and the fly in art lacked their admirers.

1595. **Helst, Bartholomeus van der.** *Portrait of Wife of Andries Bicker.* A good, substantial portrait, somewhat hard in drawing as in texture and a little over-cleaned, but honest and forceful. No. 1596 is, perhaps, less interesting—the green curtain being disturbing.

1664A. **Hobbema, Meindert.** *Water-Mill.* It is spotty in the lights upon the leaves and is not very good in unity of effect or in colour.

1665. ——*Road between Dwellings and Trees.* A fine little landscape warm in tone and good in the sky. The trees are angleworm-like in the forms of the

branches—the branches being painted in after (and on top of) the foliage.

1889. **Holbein the Younger, Hans.** ***Sir Thomas Godsalve and His Son.*** Two red-nosed people, probably of Holbein's creation, but by no means as strong in characterisation and drawing as some other of his portraits. The flesh-red of these faces is like that of No. 586D in the Berlin Gallery and is, perhaps, as indicative of the copyist, as seen in the Burgomaster Meyer Madonna near at hand (No. 1892), as of Holbein. Notice the slightly drawn hands. Somewhat repainted.

1890. ** ——***Portrait of Morett the Goldsmith.*** A fine example of Holbein's more elaborate art. Notice the details of dress, chain, glove, hand, beard. It is absolute in its truth of drawing and texture. And, for all its minute workmanship, the picture does not lose in bulk or appear trifling or finical. It seems astonishing that in a picture of this size this small work does not become petty. A curtain shuts out the background and seems obtrusive; but then the picture was always lacking in the third dimension—depth. Notice the grey flesh of the face and then compare it with the red faces in the copy of the Burgomaster Meyer Madonna hanging next to it. The Holbein flesh is not always the congested red seen in No. 1889. Notice the hand—that excellent hand! Once attributed to Leonardo da Vinci!

1892. **Holbein the Younger, Hans (after).** ***Madonna of the Burgomaster Meyer.*** This is a copy after the Darmstadt picture, but interesting to study even though a copy. It lacks in quality and force but gives the composition and drawing right enough.

The Madonna and Child are a little pretty and perhaps overdone in sentiment, as also the two children below, but the Burgomaster is a fine type as are the women of his family on the opposite side. The carpet is annoying in its tricky wrinkle.

839. **Isenbrant, Adriaen.** ***The Magdalen.*** This picture could not with reason be given to Gerard David and so it has been given, with some stretch of the imagination, to his shadowy pupil Isenbrant. It has a David look about it and is probably by some one in his school, but why Isenbrant? When you find a painter's name in an old register, is that sufficient to give you superior knowledge of his artistic style and enable you to select his pictures from hither and yon? It would seem so from the conclusions of certain experts. Notice in this picture the head-dress, the green ground, and also the sentiment.

1805. **Jongh, Ludolf.** ***Mother and Daughter.*** What very simple and direct Dutch portraiture! There is no thought here of anything but the truth of the sitters' appearance—the truth of representation. How very straightforward and frank these people are! Look at them a moment—their faces, hands, clothes—and then look at the simple background.

1009. **Jordaens, Jakob.** ***Ariadne and Bacchus.*** A large and rather coarse Jordaens—not coarse in subject but in the painting of it. The grouping, with the light flesh of the women in the centre and the mounting up of nude figures in the form of a pyramid, is well done and the drawing of the large, lumpy figures is very good. The colour lacks vitality for all its warmth. The picture is not nearly

so satisfactory as the Fecundity (No. 235) at Brussels. The fruit is possibly by another hand.

1011. ——*The Prodigal Son.* This picture has the snap of colour and light in it that No. 1009 lacks, though here we meet with another difficulty in wandering composition and rambling drawing. It is, however, very decisively painted. And what a good glimpse of distant landscape off at the right!

1012. ——*Presentation in the Temple.* As a matter of church art—an altar-piece, perhaps—this is hardly successful. It is a little heavy in spirit and prosaic in treatment. See how much more life No. 1010 has about it.

1010. ——*Diogenes with the Lantern.* The light and colour of it are excellent and the handling of it spirited for Jordaens. The canvas, however, is too full of figures and miscellaneous plunder, and the drawing is exaggerated. Notice, for instance, the ropy wrinkles upon the figure of Diogenes. But there is sparkling light in the picture that gives it life.

1258. * **Knupfer, Nicolaus.** *The Painter's Family.* Why is it not well done all through, from floor to ceiling, figures included? The drawing is excellent and the colour is no less so. How well the chilren are drawn and painted! How well that bit of white is used! And what can be said in dispraise of the table-cloth, the costumes, the floor? Often there are painters quite unknown to fame who pop up with an excellent picture to make us wonder why they did not do more of them.

1612A. **Koninck, Philips.** *Holland Landscape.* It is crudely done in the clouds, the foliage, the fore-

ground, and is so poor an example of Koninck as to make one almost doubt its genuineness. And yet it has all the earmarks of Koninck's work.

1589A. **Koninck, Salomon.** ***An Astronomer.*** It might at one time have been catalogued as a Rembrandt though its weakness is very apparent. The colour is a little like Rembrandt in his grey period though darker and with blackish shadows.

1589. ——***The Hermit.*** A washed-out performance, weak in every way. Even the emphasised wrinkles in the forehead, with the hand, nose, and beard, lack force and accent. But it is much admired by the tourist.

1582. **Lievens, Jan.** ***An Old Man.*** Here is another Rembrandt follower and imitator. His works under his own name are scarce, and it is not, perhaps, an error to think that some of them are still under Rembrandt's name. See the comment upon his works under Rembrandt in The Hague notes of this series.

194A. * **Lotto, Lorenzo.** ***Madonna and Child with St. John.*** An attractive picture, not only in its sentiment, which is so intense that it is almost strained, but also in its unusual scheme of colour. Lotto is here apparent in a beguiling, winning mood. Perhaps both the colour and the mood incline to sweetness but stop before they reach sentimentality. The handling is smooth and (under the glass) too porcelain-like. The lilacs, blues, and reds are lovely in tone but possibly a little cloying. A landscape to correspond.

1901. **Maler von Ulm, Hans.** ***Portrait of a Man.*** A good portrait—direct, honest, simple. The out-

line of the figure cuts against the crude green ground rather sharply. See also No. 1902.

51. * **Mantegna, Andrea.** ***Holy Family.*** It belongs, as the catalogue states, to the "late Mantuan period" of Mantegna and is in colour brighter than No. 29 in the Berlin Gallery, which it resembles in a measure. It is excellent in drawing and superb in characterisation. The Madonna type seems still Bellinesque, the parents of the Virgin at the back are very forceful, and the Child is graceful in pose. The drapery is a little liny. To be compared with the two pictures in the Louvre (Nos. 1375, 1376) in the matter of grace of form. The latter are far beyond this, but this points the way for them. The colour is superb in reds, oranges, and greens, but again the Louvre pictures are the brighter. All three are "late" Mantegnas and of much excellence. This picture has been injured by cleaning.

Master of the Death of the Virgin. See Cleve, Juste van.

123. **Mazzolino, Ludovico.** ***Christ Presented to the People.*** The colours are given in sharp contrast to the architecture, being warm reds, while the architecture is cold, frozen, ice-like. The picture is not a good one for Mazzolino.

1736. **Metsu, Gabriel.** ***The Lady with Lace Pillow.*** Very nice in textures, simple in the composition, good in atmosphere. It just falls short of being a Terborch in quality. The colour wants in snap but is nevertheless charming. The drawing is right all through.

1732. ——***The Lovers.*** A very good piece of painting and excellent in colour. Metsu is not to be classed

with Netscher and Mieris. He comes nearer to ranking with Terborch and is at times almost his equal.

1315. **Mierevelt, Michiel Jansz.** ***Man's Portrait.*** Precise and smooth. A little retouched and not wonderful in any way. It is, however, an example of that good quality of portrait work which all the Dutch painters turned out.

1316 } ——***Portraits of a Man and Woman.*** The man's
1317 } portrait is better than the woman's. Both are precise and tight in their workmanship. No doubt they came out of the Mierevelt picture factory, but whether or not by the master's own hand is not easily determined.

1742. **Mieris, Frans van (the Elder).** ***Young Woman Receiving a Love-Letter.*** This is comparable to the art of Dou or Netscher. It is in the same vein and corresponds in its lack of intrinsic art value, though it shows good workmanship and some colour sense.

201. **Morando Paolo (Il Cavazzola).** ***Portrait of a Man.*** The sleeves remind one vaguely of, say, Antonio Moro, or Holbein. Somewhat pretentious as portraiture and a little pinched in drawing. It shows a strong enough type but is weak in itself—has a weak spirit, and is painted with a careful but weak brush. There is a feeling of Caroto about it—Caroto not at his best, perhaps.

847. **Moro, Antonio.** ***Portrait of a Canon.*** A fine, strong head, done precisely, truthfully, but with no triviality or pettiness. Notice the drawing in the eyes, nose, and cheeks. There is no particular reason why it should be put down to Moro. It has

features that suggest Scorel. Once attributed to Holbein.

703B. **Murillo, Bartolomé Estéban.** ***Death of St. Clara.*** The picture is rather impressive at first glance, but further inquiry discloses it as wanting in good drawing, colour, and atmospheric setting. Also the figures in white in the back row are not in value and the figures in the foreground stand out too much. Moreover, the whites are not well seen or well handled and are wanting in quality—that quality which whites are strikingly susceptible of in the hands of genius. The central figure near the bed is not lacking in grace but fails to unite the two sides of the picture. The figures at the right from which she came are not related or in harmony with the shadowed figures at the left. As for the background, it is neither smoke nor cloud. Finally, the spirit of the scene seems weak as though the painter were lacking in mental stamina. It is an early Murillo and hurt by repainting.

704. ——***St. Rodriguez.*** The large figure is no stronger than the small angel leaning out of the sky. The robe and its embroidery are not badly given, and the colour is acceptable though lacking in fine quality.

705. ——***Madonna and Child.*** A good example of Murillo's popular pictures. They are popular largely because they are pretty. The spirit here is sweet, and the drawing and colour are sweet, also. Somewhat repainted.

1671. **Neer, Eglon Hendrik van der.** ***Lute-Player.*** What a pretty right hand on the lute! And why is the picture not nice in colour and textures?

Perhaps it is a little too smooth and porcelain-like, but there is considerable skill about it, if not a Terborch quality.

1347 } **Netscher, Caspar.** ***Interiors with Figures.*** Good
1351 } examples of Netscher's small, smooth, not to say smart, workmanship. The textures are overdone, and the surfaces point the way to the glittering superficialities of Van der Werff and Philip van Dyck. No. 1353 is so good that one might doubt if Netscher ever saw it, yet sometimes he did just such excellent work.

811. **Orley, Bernard van.** ***Portrait of a Man.*** It contains careful drawing and cost the painter some labour, and yet there is no very striking effect. It is a little soft, both mentally and technically. Formerly attributed to Holbein and now doubtfully to Van Orley.

810. ——***Holy Family.*** A smooth picture (made more smooth by being placed under glass) with Renaissance architecture and a rather good landscape. The head of Joseph is fairly good, the Madonna a little affected, the angel naïve. Carefully but timidly done. It may be a copy.

1398. **Ostade, Adriaen van.** ***Peasants in an Interior.*** Very good in drawing, simple in colour scheme, excellent in textures, broad and effective in its painting. A little smooth, perhaps, and not so certain as Brouwer but very good work. See also No. 1397.

188. * **Palma Vecchio.** ***Madonna, Child, and Two Saints.*** It belongs to the earlier time of the master and is very good in colour. The hills, sky, and clouds are perhaps crude. The group is well bal-

anced and the Madonna is lovely in tenderness. The picture has been injured by cleaning.

189. ** ——*The Three Sisters.* Large Palmesque types with full, free draperies, small hands, finely cut features, rounded contours, large forms. Very beautiful in the colour of the robes and in the fine landscape. Unfortunately, the picture has been dulled in the flesh-notes by too much cleaning. The necks and shoulders are flat as the result of the modelling having been rubbed away. The sister at the right has been hurt in the neck and cheek; the one at the left in the mouth, nose, and eye. There has been repainting here also. What beautiful blues, reds, and browns! The best Palma in the gallery, and one of the best in existence. Done in Palma's middle period.

190. ——*Venus.* Not so pleasing in line nor so distinguished in type as the Giorgione Venus near at hand, though it (the Palma) is too much repainted to judge of its one-time merits. The quality of the flesh-notes seems entirely gone. It has been superseded by something that looks like mere whitish paint. The landscape is now the best part of the picture. The figure still has grace and charm about it, but its colour and surface have vanished. It never could have possessed the refinement of the Giorgione Venus.

191. * ——*Holy Family with St. Catherine.* Very interesting in its balanced composition, the swinging lines of the women, and their fine colour. It is a late work, and the figure of Joseph and the children have a Lottesque look about them. It is, all told, the second best Palma in this gallery. The flesh and draperies have been much cleaned and

somewhat repainted, especially in the hands of St. Catherine and St. Joseph. There is beautiful colour in St. Catherine's robe and the landscape is very good. Joseph and the children are Jewish in type. This was also characteristic of Lotto, as shown in his Woman Taken in Adultery (No. 1349) in the Louvre. The landscape suggests resemblances to that of the Louvre Rustic Concert by Giorgione.

192. ——*Jacob and Rachel.* With the exception of the two central figures, it is a poor affair. The landscape with the recurrent lines of hills, the trees, cattle, and sky are coarsely and crudely done as though some weak follower rather than Palma were handling the brush. Compare it with the landscape in No. 189. The picture is not good for Palma in light, colour, or drawing and is quite down to the level of Cariani or Bonifazio. At one time it was thought to be by Giorgione. It is proper to say, however, that the surface is much hurt by repainting, and it is not just to Palma (or Cariani, either) to judge him by its present condition. Notice for repainting the hands and necks of Jacob and Rachel, also the man seated at the left. The brush-work is not now "broad" but simply ineffective. It is probably a genuine Palma but a poor one. Morelli, however, calls it "an exquisite idyll."

42. **Palmezzano, Marco.** *Adoration of Kings.* Notice it as a modern forgery, as the catalogue suggests. It is probably kept on the wall as an awful example.

20. * **Piero di Cosimo.** *Holy Family and Angels.* A tondo in which Piero shows that he knows how to fill a round space with figures just as well as his

companions. The drawing is harsh, almost savage, but is effective in producing a large grace in the Madonna with a smoother effect in the children and angels at the top—the angels being especially charming. The colour is good and the picture is in tone throughout. The landscape is effective.

41. **Pinturicohio, Bernardo.** ***Portrait of a Boy.*** A * work in tempera, charming in its frankness and in its straightforward method. It is very simply done—done with the definite aim of giving the truth but giving it gracefully. What a boyish boy, full of sincerity and even dignity! He is quite unconscious of how well he carries himself. And what a charming landscape at the back! The colour looks a little washed out by comparison with the oil-paintings about it and the flesh-notes have now an undertone of green. A work of truth and character. But why Pinturicchio? It is nearer Perugino.

102. **Piombo, Sebastiano del.** ***Christ Bearing the Cross.*** It shows the influence of Michelangelo in the hands and drapery, of Giorgione in the helmet and the shadowed landscape. There are other versions of this picture at Madrid and St. Petersburg. It is not possible now to say which is the original work.

1390. **Poorter, Willem de.** ***Christ and the Adulteress.*** It is in the small, smooth style of Poorter but should be studied because this same style makes its appearance in pictures of this class attributed to Rembrandt in European galleries—notably in The Hague Museum, and the National Gallery, London. See also No. 1389.

1391. ——***Presentation in the Temple.*** Said to be a copy by Poorter after the original Rembrandt in The Hague. But is The Hague picture an original Rembrandt or an original Poorter? Neither this picture nor that is of Rembrandt mind or hand. They, in company with a similar picture in the London National Gallery (No. 45), are probably all by some weak Rembrandt follower of the Poorter kind. Look at it closely and the whole conception (aside from the copy) will appear too merely pretty for Rembrandt.

1629. **Potter, Paulus.** ***Cattle.*** Very good in the cattle seen under broken and shadowed light. The shadows, atmosphere, and sky are all good. This is an exceptional Potter though by no means a wonder. It lacks in colour and is immature in spots.

1630. ——***Resting Herd.*** This is painting of a very mediocre quality. The brush is rasping, the surface unpleasant, the decorative quality quite wanting. The foliage spread against the sky, and the sheep, illustrate this.

721. **Poussin, Nicolas.** ***Reclining Venus.*** Poussin is, perhaps, seen at his best in the Louvre, but there are a number of his works in this Dresden Gallery that might be noticed. This Venus is, perhaps, as good as his average and is graceful in line if slight in form. The figure makes a handsome spot of light in the centre of the composition. See also No. 722 for graceful figures. The colour is usually too hot (as in No. 717), and the cold blues fail to temper it.

60. **Previtali, Andrea.** ***Madonna, Child, and St. John.*** A pretty Madonna, somewhat cold in colour, with a carefully painted landscape and a

castle in the distance. It is much cleaned, especially in the St. John at the right with the very flat side face.

93. **Raphael Sanzio.** ***The Sistine Madonna.*** This is
*** probably the best-known picture in the world. It is the most important of Raphael's Madonnas and in its present placing an excellent illustration of the sad favour to which the church art of Italy has come. It was originally painted for the Church of San Sisto at Piacenza and in that church was placed over the high altar in full view of the kneeling worshippers. The Madonna with the Child in her arms is shown coming forward on the clouds to meet the congregation. She is holding up the Child to them as the Light and Salvation of the World. A cherub throng in a golden halo is back of her. Two of the cherubs have arrived before her and are resting their elbows on the actual altar top. The altar-piece curtains are drawn apart. San Sisto (Pope Sixtus II), the patron saint of the church, his papal crown resting on the altar, is kneeling on the clouds, not "commending himself," as your Baedeker, quoting a compatriot, has it; but with one hand on his bosom and the other pointing out to the kneeling worshippers he is saying as plainly as possible: "Not for me! not for me! but for these poor people in my care."

As a part of worship, as a matter of religious belief, as an engine of the church in teaching the faith, this picture in its original setting must have been powerful and impressive. Raphael designed it for that purpose and for that place. Taking it away from the Church of San Sisto destroyed its significance as religion and its meaning as art. In the

small, square room of the Dresden Gallery the beautiful Madonna, Child in arms, now walks down upon the clouds to meet, not a believing throng upon its knees praying for intercession and help, but a miscellaneous throng of tourists who are standing about and for the most part making foolish remarks about the picture. Usually some one is deprecating in a loud whisper the fad about the old masters and is, perhaps, declaring with vast superfluity that "he does not understand these old Madonna pictures." No, he does not—more's the pity. And, to tell the bald truth, the picture has little meaning where it is placed. Even the look of it is greatly distorted. The glaring side windows throw the worst possible light upon it and make the colour look even cruder than it is. It was originally laid in by Raphael with bright colours that it might hold at a distance in a dimly lighted church.

Technically, the picture is not painted in a positive or a final manner. Raphael as a painter never came to maturity in the Titian-Velasquez sense. The Sistine Madonna is little more than a beautiful drawing filled in with agreeable but rather thin colour. It is a pyramidal composition, the apex of the pyramid being the Madonna's head and the side lines leading down to the saints at right and left. The curtains at the top fill in the upper spaces; the altar and the cherubs help out at the bottom. The figure of the Madonna is hardly that of a Greek Victory nor even so select in proportions as the Giorgione Sleeping Venus in a near room. It is rather squared by the puff-out of the drapery but has excellent movement, and is quite above reproach in its drawing. Even more striking in drawing is the nude Child—a superb effect. The look of

wonder in both Mother and Child was produced by making their eyes large, round, and wide apart —something Raphael had learned from Byzantine art. The draperies are not only very large and fine in drawing but very effective in giving the sense of motion. San Sisto is again almost faultless in drawing. Notice the excellence of his hands. St. Barbara at the right shows the influence of Leonardo in the type. Her face is averted from the shining vision, as though the light were blinding. Her head and shoulders are well given, but the left hand and arm are somewhat scant and unconvincing. The cherubs or cupids at the bottom (the most admired feature of the picture) are pulpy, heavy, unsatisfactory, and somewhat repainted. All told, this is a masterpiece of drawing and design—a superb picture, out of place and misunderstood even by professional artists.

1562. * **Rembrandt van Ryn.** ***Saskia with the Red Flower.*** The characterisation is charming, the colour rich, the shadow masses luminous and yet possessed of mystery. The hands have been hurt but are still lifelike. The shadow about the head is blistered and cracked, the fillet has been retouched, the hair repainted, the face and mouth tampered with, but Rembrandt is still under it. Stand back and see the modelling of the cheeks and chin. Notice how different the colour is from that of all the Rembrandt followers in depth and clarity.

1557. * ——***Portrait of William Burggraeff.*** This is certainly a Rembrandt and must be used as a criterion of his early work. It is in his grey period and dated 1633. Notice the clearness of the flesh tones, the luminosity of the grey background, the draw-

ing and modelling of the mouth, chin, nose, eyes. Somewhat over-cleaned but a very good portrait. It has simplicity, solidity, and substance about it. The collar has a pattern in it made by drawing through the wet paint with the wooden end of the brush, but this working through wet paint is not the same performance as Lievens shows us in his work upon hair and beard.

1558. ——*Ganymede.* This picture has long been accepted as a Rembrandt though poor enough in colour and handling to be by some one of his school. It belongs to the so-called grey period, but the grey is more like that in No. 1559 than in No. 1557. It is thin and unsatisfactory, let the indiscriminate admirers of alleged Rembrandts say what they may. There is nothing about it that a Bol or a Backer could not have done. The little figure is well drawn enough, but it hardly shows Rembrandt's drawing. The more one studies it the more one doubts it. And yet one cannot deny that it is Rembrandtesque.

1556. * ——*Saskia.* The sitter does not look like Saskia nor the work like that of Rembrandt. It is utterly different, both as regards the sitter and the painter, from the Saskia (No. 256) at Cassel, and yet both were supposed to be painted in the same year. How was it possible for Rembrandt to see Saskia in two such opposed views? Here she is a coarse, vulgar little fishwife; there she is very much of a lady. And how could he think in such different terms of colour or light-and-shade or paint with such a different brush? This Dresden picture is too small in mental grasp for Rembrandt, too pinched and spare in design, too bleached in the

high lights of the colours. Moreover, neither the high lights nor the deep shadows are Rembrandtesque in quality or touch. It is a good picture in itself, but it has not the mental or technical grip of the master. The face is very well modelled and easily handled; the costume is less certain in touch. It is possibly by some follower like Poorter. Compare Poorter's alleged copy after Rembrandt (No. 1391) in this gallery for the handling, making allowance for this being a large picture and being brushed in larger than Poorter's usual work. The faded high lights also suggest Poorter.

1559. ——***Rembrandt and Saskia.*** This is perhaps a genuine Rembrandt, but it is not the great affair it was one time thought to be. It is a little thin in light and also in the shadows. In drawing it is by no means positive, and in colour it has the pallor of a Ferdinand Bol. The background of peacock's feathers is poorly done, the wall does not recede, and the textures are not very convincing. The picture is hurt by scrubbing and cleaning, which may account for its weak appearance. It is a grey-period picture—Bol's grey period, perhaps, rather than Rembrandt's.

1560. ——***Samson's Wedding Feast.*** The types at the extreme right and left are not Rembrandt's, nor is the general scheme of light his. The picture is dated 1638 but has the same blues as the alleged Saskia (No. 1556) of 1633. It is probably (but not certainly) by the same hand that helped Rembrandt with the six pictures of the Passion at Munich—that is, Eeckhout. Of course, it was good business to have Rembrandt's name on it, and from the number of falsely signed pictures emanating from

the Netherlands we know that the Dutch of Rembrandt's time and later did not despise the business side of art. It is a fairly good picture, though it wanders and falls out at the left. The colour is satisfactory.

1561. ——***Hunter with Bittern.*** If we accept No. 1557 as a Rembrandt standard, then this picture can hardly be said to live up to it. Examine No. 1557 closely in the drawing of the eyes and mouth, and then pass immediately to the eyes and mouth of this Bittern Hunter picture. Is not the weak drawing and painting of the latter instantly apparent? Perhaps repainted, you say? Yes, perhaps; but other things in the picture correspond to such palpable defects as the painting of the mouth. The shadow on the face is somewhat false in value, the light is not luminous, the figure is a guess, the hat and the hair are fumbled. The painting of the bird is the best thing in the picture. The surface is somewhat injured. Yet, with these defects noted, it still shows as a picture of some beauty and charm.

1563. ** ——***Manoah's Offering.*** A splendid Rembrandt as regards the figures of Manoah and his wife. What wonderful types! How they kneel! How they pray! Manoah is leaning over as though to hear what his wife might say, but she is absorbed and wholly unconscious. How real and true they are in their bulk of body, their weight, their attitudes, their hands clasped in prayer! The drawing is large, dealing with the essentials of form and not bothering about petty details. And what glorious colour! Rembrandt never went beyond that glowing colour. But the rest of the picture is

more or less of a drag on the flight. The fire throws a glitter on the robes and tries to hold the picture together; but the angel and the shadowy background do not support or help the figures and might almost as well have been omitted. The picture, if cut down to the two figures, would lose little. The figures themselves are superb—masterful. Keep this colour in mind in looking at certain large pictures attributed to Rembrandt, such as the Centurion Cornelius, in the Wallace Collection. The brush and palette here are very different from there.

1564. ——***The Gold Weigher.*** It will never satisfy any one as a Rembrandt. The head-dress alone is sufficient to condemn it. The face and hands are not badly done, but they are not in the style of Rembrandt; and the colour is good, but again it is not Rembrandtesque. It is an indifferent school piece, in the same class with the so-called Rembrandt Money Changer at Berlin (No. 828D).

1565. ——***Portrait of a Young Warrior.*** In the Rembrandt vein and style but only superficially so. It is too slight and weak. Perhaps it is a copy or, at best, only a school piece. It might have been done by the same hand that did the Bittern Hunter (No. 1561).

1566. ——***Entombment.*** A school copy of the picture in Munich (No. 330), with an indication here of how much the Munich picture must have suffered by cleaning and restoration. This copy has every look of having been done by the painter of the Centurion Cornelius in the Wallace Collection (No. 86), the Christ before Pilate (No. 386) at Budapest, and the David and Saul (No. 621) at

The Hague. The painter was probably Flinck, but that is not a thing one can state with certainty.

1567. * ——*Portrait of an Old Man.* An excellent head though somewhat puzzling and perplexing. It is much kneaded and thumbed in the face and beard and is rather hot in colour but certainly has strength about it. Compare it with No. 1557 for the same large point of view but a different treatment of the surface, possibly due to Rembrandt's advanced age and freer hand. It was painted in 1654. Compare it again with No. 1570 for the different treatment of the hat, pearls, and underdress, as also the illumination. It is apparently of Rembrandt origin but not too certainly by his unaided hand.

1568. ——*Man with the Red Cap.* This is by the painter of black shadows and square block hands, whose works are sometimes confused with those of Rembrandt. The picture is well done in the face and rather strong all through, but it has not the Rembrandt touch or quality. The scheme of light and colour is also too dark, too blackish for him. Once attributed to Fabritius, to whom it should be restored. It fits him better than any one else. Compare it with the Fabritius here (No. 1591).

1569. ——*Portrait of the Artist.* Here, again, we have the square-block hand and the dirty, non-luminous shadow. The face is as broad as a pan and with not a trace of Rembrandt's hand in its painting. Notice the squarely drawn eyes and mouth and the badly done ear. It is now somewhat injured but was never at any time a picture by Rembrandt. It is the heavy work of a pupil trying to paint a portrait of his master, perhaps, or that studio

model who we have been led to think was Rembrandt himself. Why is it necessary to see Rembrandt's hand in all these thumbed and gummed canvases? Did his pupils never grow old, never torture their canvases, never miss their drawing, never indulge in glittering high lights? Did Rembrandt possess all the vices as well as virtues of the painter's craft?

1570. * ——***Man with the Pearls in His Hat.*** A strong picture but not very characteristic of Rembrandt at any period of his life. The shadows are too dark, the high lights too bright and glittering, the pearls and borders of the dress too spotty. It is customary to put down these pictures with pot-black shadows, glittering high lights, and messy surfaces to Rembrandt's old age, but they do not agree in any way with such a portrait as No. 221 in the National Gallery, London, showing Rembrandt at sixty. The surface there is thumbed, and the colour is hot, but there is no blackness, no block-shaped hands, no flare of spotty lights. But this is undeniably a strong portrait, and Rembrandt may have done it.

1571. ——***Old Man with a Stick.*** A good picture, but again the hands and shadows are not convincingly like Rembrandt, and the hair and the beard are much tortured by small strokes of the brush. The cloak and hat have been repainted, as the catalogue intimates. It must be accepted with several grains of salt. Compare it with the Koninck here (No. 1589A).

1573. **Rembrandt, School of.** ***Portrait.*** A very good work by a pupil or follower not to be named with any certainty. It has a suggestion of Aert de

Gelder about it. A little pulpy in the face but fairly well drawn and good in colour. The handling is free but not very effective.

1575. * ——*Landscape.* With a blackish thunder-cloud in the sky peculiar to the landscapes of Hercules Seghers. A strong landscape and just as interesting as those put down directly to Rembrandt at Cassel and elsewhere. The green patches on the pattern of light and dark are very effective. Thought by Dr. Bode and others to be by Aert de Gelder, about whose landscape performances little or nothing is known. It is nearer to Seghers.

324. **Reni, Guido.** ***Venus and Cupid.*** A better picture in colour and tone than Guido usually painted but weak in spirit and even weaker in drawing and modelling. It has been much cleaned and repainted. Many pictures belonging to the late Bolognese School are in this gallery, but they are not satisfactory though in some respects fairly good pieces of drawing and handling.

323, 329, 330 ——***Heads of Christ.*** These are the kind of pictures that Guido did, early, late, and often. They are badly drawn, smoothly painted, with cut-and-dried sentiment. The eyes of No. 323 are not set in the head but in the cheek and could not look any way but up. Still, people will love such pictures. The Caracci (No. 309) is much better but is soft and pretty, too.

683. **Ribera, Jusefe (Lo Spagnoletto).** ***St. Agnes.*** A more graceful affair than usual with Ribera. He is more frequently dark in spirit, peculiarly Spanish in sentiment, somewhat tragic and forbidding in his themes. His scheme of light and

dark (derived from Caravaggio) supplements the darkness of his spirit. In this picture he is inclined to lightness and even prettiness, losing something in good drawing and forceful modelling.

682. ——***Diogenes.*** A strong head at the top—that is, about the forehead and eyes—but a weak one lower down, under the beard. See also No. 686.

45 } **Roberti, Ercole de'.** ***The Betrayal and The Way***
46 } ***to Calvary.*** Two panels by a pupil or follower of Tura. The third panel of the original predella is in the Royal Institution, Liverpool. They are good in tone and light, sculpturesque in the draperies, and rather harsh in the drawing. The action is right, and perhaps the best part of them is the colour—the rich, fine colour. What well-shown rocks! And with a sky that has light in it. The Christ and sleeping apostles at the left in No. 46 suggest the influence of Mantegna or Bellini or perhaps both.

676. **Roelas, Juan de las.** ***The Conception.*** Original and unique in colour, as also in feeling. It is, of course, hard in the drawing, Roelas being something of an early realist. He followed Tintoretto in colour.

103. **Romano, Giulio.** ***Madonna della Catina.*** This is not a great picture in itself, but it is an important late work of Giulio Romano, the most considerable of Raphael's pupils. He is to be seen completely only in Rome and Mantua (Palazzo del Tè). The flesh and robes here are bleached in the high lights after the late Roman manner. The picture is hurt by repainting, as in the St. Anne at the left and also in the Madonna.

1510A. **Rombouts, Salomon.** ***Landscape.*** A fine, warm-toned landscape with a strong sky and clouds. It has much force about it. It would be the better if the little tree in the foreground with its spotty foliage were out of the picture. Formerly ascribed to Decker. It shows the Ruisdael influence.

955. * **Rubens, Peter Paul.** ***St. Jerome.*** This is an early Rubens, and yet it bears small trace of any Italian influence save in method. The master is a true Fleming almost from the beginning. The drawing and handling are a little more constrained than later on, yet both are simple and fluent. What drawing in the head, shoulders, and foreshortened hand! What colour—what flesh colour! Compare it with the Van Dyck of the same subject (No. 1024), and see the note on the Van Dyck. Rubens is always the greater—he says things more easily and simply than his pupil. A little hurt.

956. * ——***Victory Crowning a Hero.*** An early example of Rubens, done probably without the aid of pupils, with sure drawing, fluid handling, fine colour, and excellent textures. Notice the fed-on-roses flesh of the Victory, the red shadows of the flesh, the twist of the body, and its fine drawing. The hair and wings suggest some repainting. Notice further the finely modelled back of the seated figure at the right and the painting of the golden hair. Another version or study for this seated figure is in the Liechtenstein Gallery in Vienna. There is excellent texture painting in the armour. And what colour in the shadow under the red robe of the warrior! The spear of the warrior unfortunately cuts the composition into two parts and breaks the unity of the group. The figures at the right hand in

shadow are empty and do not help the composition. It is a glowing canvas. At Cassel a somewhat similar picture (No. 91).

957. ——***The Drunken Hercules.*** An early example of the Bacchanalian themes often repeated in the Rubens shop. The theme itself may be repellent to some, but how well it is realised, how truthfully drawn and painted! Notice how closely the composition is knit together—the three figures making a statuesque oval group. And notice also how the swinging lines of the oval help out and accent the swaying movement of the group. It is something that Rubens designed and his pupils executed. It does not show Rubens's own handling. Compare the brush-work with that in No. 956.

957A. ——***Satyr and Nymph with Fruit.*** The peculiar heat here shown in the colour of the faces was more characteristic of Jordaens than of Rubens. But this picture is probably some school replica. It is easily done but not precisely as Rubens did things. There is a Jordaens look about it hard to get away from.

958. ——***Old Woman with Brazier.*** This is a portion of the Brussels picture, Venus at the Forge of Vulcan (No. 382), which was sawed off and is now the separate picture No. 958 here at Dresden. It looks as though it had been done by Honthorst and is certainly not characteristic of Rubens, save in a certain liquid way of handling paint, which he imparted to the whole school.

958A. ——***Last Judgment.*** Said to be a sketch by Rubens for his large picture at Munich (No. 735). It is apparently not a copy after the larger picture,

though it is just the sort of thing that would be copied by pupils in order to gain knowledge of the figure. It has the appearance of a sketch, and that, too, by Rubens's own hand.

960. * ——***Portrait of a Man.*** It is not unlike Nos. 1022, 1023, 1023c, and 1023d, put down to Van Dyck —a good, straightforward portrait, but obviously not in Rubens's early style though inclining more to Rubens than to his pupil. There is some confusion here between the portraits that belong to Rubens and those that belong to Van Dyck. The truth is, the portraits are not markedly characteristic of either painter, and yet they lie somewhere between the two, unless we postulate a third painter at present unknown to us. In either or any event, they are fairly well done.

962a. ——***Diana's Return from the Hunt.*** The catalogue thinks it may be a good workshop picture, though Rooses thinks the figures by Rubens and the animals by Snyders. It is a good picture in colour and the Diana and the heads back of her are excellent. They are good enough for Rubens's own hand. He probably did them.

962. ——***The Boar Hunt.*** With a woodland landscape quite different from the Rainbow landscape in the Wallace Collection or its companion piece in the National Gallery, but still crude, hard, raw in drawing and colour. The figures and animals are only a very little better than the trees and sky. There is good action, but the men, horses, and dogs are carelessly done though not conspicuously spotty in high lights. On the contrary, they keep their place in the setting of the landscape very well. It can hardly be accepted as a criterion of

the Rubens landscape. He may have planned it, but it has probably been worked upon by pupils, especially at the right in the sky and distance.

962c. ——***Mercury and Argus.*** A late Rubens, good in colour and freely done, with a landscape that matches the figures very well. What a good figure, that of Mercury! It is a bit rubbed.

962b. ——***Judgment of Paris.*** It is probably an old copy—perhaps a school copy—of the larger picture in the National Gallery, London. Study the painting of the hair, hats, robes, flesh. It is a much weaker and more uncertain brush than that of Rubens. Said to be a replica but it is more likely a plain old copy.

964b. ——***Quos Ego.*** A huge picture, originally done for decoration upon the triumphal arch erected in Antwerp in 1635 for the entrance of the Cardinal Infante Ferdinand. A work probably executed by pupils in the workshop, in haste, and with no idea of its ever being seen at close range.

964a. ——***Portrait of a Woman with Crimped Hair.*** Painted in a way that still shows the painter's brush, though it has been a little hurt by cleaning. Probably never more than a sketch with the background rubbed in. But an effective portrait. At one time thought a likeness of Helene Fourment.

965. ——***Bathsheba.*** This is not a very attractive Rubens. It is genuine enough, and probably of his late period, but more prosaic than the subject calls for. The composition is not well held together, the negro and the architecture being out of it. The knees and legs of the chief figure are good, but the attendant figure above is coarse and hard

and the curtain rather stupid. The picture lacks in quality all through. Probably it was worked on by pupils in its inception and later on by restorers.

986B. ——*Portrait of the Painter's Sons.* Said by the catalogue to be a copy after the original in the Liechtenstein Gallery at Vienna, but it has every indication of being more than that implies. Look at the free painting of the bird, the hair, the garments. The faces are more timidly done. If a copy, it was done by some painter of skill. It is likely a genuine Rubens and is as good as the Liechtenstein example.

1492. * **Ruisdael, Jacob van.** *The Hunt.* A large and important Ruisdael but not differing materially from his usual performance except that it is more imposing. It is the same convention that he customarily shows us, with perhaps more skill shown in the handling of sky reflection in the water and a little more elaborate handling of the dead beech in the foreground. The sky is stormy and again impressive. Certainly a decorative picture. The animals are thought to be by A. van de Velde.

1494. ——*The Cloister.* Of interest among the numerous Ruisdaels here, possibly because parts of it seem done from nature instead of out of the painter's head. He was striving for some realistic effect in the cloister and hill at the left, but he could not refrain from lugging in his white tree trunk and formal foliage at the right and that stormy sky at the top.

1500. ——*Landscape.* Attractive for the path through the woods but slate-like in colour and dull in light. The foliage is rather crudely painted.

1502. * ——*Jewish Burying-Ground.* A dramatic composition with its central spot of light, but it is not more enjoyable than his smaller and simpler scenes. Still, with the dark sky and foreground, the light centred on the white tombs and repeated in the tree and waterfall, it makes a striking if forced landscape effect. All of the foreground is exactly and truthfully drawn and the background is shut out by storm-clouds. How very like a landscape seen in a dark mirror! Was that the way Ruisdael studied nature? His pictures suggest as much. Perhaps the best-known Ruisdael here, and a celebrated work.

1496. * ——*Castle Bentheim.* Very good, especially in the castle on the right and the way it caps the hill. There are two points of sight—a peculiarity of Ruisdael's often in evidence. The far view down the valley at the left is attractive and the sky and foliage are better than usual.

1504. ——*Canal before a Village.* A much-tortured surface (in the foliage) from many repeated and ineffective strokes of a small brush. The result is a pettiness in the work that is depressing. This is less marked in No. 1493, but both landscapes are lacking in large drawing of foliage as also in colour and light.

1503. ——*Village Back from the Dunes.* Not so imposing as the larger Ruisdaels (Nos. 1494, 1502), but it is a question if such scenes as this and No. 1499 are not more enjoyable in their simplicity and naturalness. The sky is cold and does not match the foreground here, but the latter in its road and fields is very good.

1498. ——*Waterfall.* Here are the usual waterfall, rock, white tree, and dark cloud seen in so many Ruisdaels. Such pictures are turned out by rote, with some decorative effect, but they are seldom well made or done with any fine feeling.

1383. **Ruysdael, Salomon van.** *Village under Trees.* A very good Ruysdael done in the manner of Van Goyen—in fact, so good that one wonders how Salomon van Ruysdael managed to do it. The sky and foreground are excellent, the trees mannered. No. 1384 is much inferior to No. 1383.

1094. **Ryckaert the Younger, David.** *Interior.* It shows rather good workmanship in the heads and the costumes. Ryckaert occasionally did very good work, though usually he is commonplace. See also No. 1093.

76. **Sarto, Andrea del.** *Marriage of St. Catherine.* A slight if bright Andrea, with pleasant colour and acceptable light-and-shade, but not a great effort either technically or mentally. The drapery of St. Catherine at the left is excellent but her face and hands are hurt by restoration. The picture is not in good condition.

77. * ——*The Sacrifice of Isaac.* The influence of Michelangelo is apparent in the drapery and the hands of Abraham and in the figure of Isaac. It is not a very satisfactory Andrea in its sentiment though well done technically and really very fine in the broadly treated landscape. In colour it is not Andrea's best effort. The red of the Abraham is rather too high in key. The picture is somewhat injured. A smaller and more pleasing version is at Madrid (No. 387).

31. **Sienese School.** ***Christ in the Tomb.*** With interesting gold work in the oval mat. The painter cannot be named with certainty.

1727. * **Steen, Jan.** ***The Dismissal of Hagar.*** A large and very fine picture, well composed, with the figure of Hagar central and the boyish Ishmael in a red coat at the right. It is very well painted. Notice the drapery of the Hagar or the Ishmael. Both types are well characterised. The sentiment is not like Steen, nor the heavy cattle, nor the hot tone, nor the sky so changed in the colour of the clouds. Still, Steen may have painted the picture. Painters do not always repeat themselves.

1726. * ——***Mother and Child.*** This is as little in the style of Steen's usual performance as No. 1727. But what a charming little picture it is! Look at that colour spot of which the child's face forms the centre. How fine it is! The mother is less brilliant in colours but just as excellent in characterisation. How very well both of them are drawn and painted! How could either face be more truthfully and yet beautifully given? Well set in the room and with a good landscape seen through the window.

1077. **Teniers the Younger, David.** ***The Liberation of St. Peter.*** There are several examples of Teniers here of which Nos. 1066, 1075, 1077, 1079 are representative and show his good painting. He was a master of the brush though at times working hastily and carelessly.

1829. **Terborch, Gerard.** ***Officer Writing.*** The colour is foxy (in the man at the right) and not pleasant. The seated figure is well done though it has some of the constraint of a copy. The room is lost at

the back. Not a good Terborch and in many respects not a Terborch at all.

1830. * ——*Lady Washing Her Hands.* With charming colour in the table-cloth, the wall and the picture-frames upon it. The satin gown (the centre of light) is beautifully done not only in texture but in drawing. Notice the short figure of the maid as a foil to the not very tall lady. Notice also the atmosphere of the room, the placing of the figures in it, and the painting of the pewter.

1833. ——*Officer Reading a Letter.* Discoloured and somewhat hurt, perhaps by repainting, but it was probably never by Terborch, in the first place. It is his style at second hand—that is, in the hands of some follower.

1831. ——*The Lute-Player.* It is over-crowded with figures, tables, and architecture, besides being superficial in its surfaces and pretty in its colouring. Not in Terborch's usual manner and more in the style of Metsu. It was probably never a good picture and is now hurt by cleaning.

1832. ——*Lady in Her Boudoir.* A single figure in a satin gown, silver-hued against red. The head is badly rendered but the gown is very good. Probably a copy of the satin-gowned figure in the picture called Paternal Advice in the Berlin (and also Amsterdam) Gallery (No. 791). Look closely at the timid handling of the red, the still-life, the dress, the shoulder-piece.

265A. **Tintoretto, Jacopo (Robusti).** *Lady in Mourning.* It has passed as a Titian and is perhaps not unworthy of that master, though it is a little coarse in touch and possibly a little nearer Tintoretto.

A very good portrait, whoever did it, though lacking in that charm of women which Tintoretto usually shows us. The head well modelled, the figure well rounded, the blacks and whites well handled.

267. ——***Holy Family with a Donor.*** It looks a little frail, as though some one in the workshop had been following Tintoretto. The sea and sky much better than the heads. The picture has been hurt.

269. ——***A Warrior with Three Figures in a Boat.*** Here is Tintoretto's grace carried just a trifle too far. The lady at the left is curving up and becoming an illuminated part of the gondola prow. The drawing is a little frail and the sea merely pretty. It is probably by some Tintoretto follower or, at best, a workshop picture. The drawing in the boy, the warrior, the women, the wall, the sea is too uncertain for Tintoretto.

266. ——***The Archangel St. Michael and Satan.*** Apparently in rather bad condition, with far too much emphasis in the high lights and a good deal of restorer's grey in the wings. There is a good downward movement of the angel group, but the drawing is queer and the colour is now lost. It was possibly never other than a school piece, though Tintoretto may have done it in a careless or tired mood.

168. * **Titian (Tiziano Vecellio).** ***Madonna and Child with Four Saints.*** An early work of Titian's and rather fine in the types of both the Madonna and the Child. The face of the Magdalen is sharp, wanting in the third dimension (thickness), and somewhat out of value, probably through too much cleaning. The sky and clouds are a little hurt, as also the St. John and the saint back of the Mag-

dalen; but, generally speaking, the surface is in fair condition owing to the picture having been painted on wood. It is a conversation picture of balanced composition, brilliant in colouring and perhaps a little weak in feeling or sentiment. The strip exposed at the bottom does not help the picture. Crowe and Cavalcaselle thought it by Andrea Schiavone.

169. ** ——*The Tribute-Money.* An early Titian, on wood, and in perfect condition save for some cleaning, which has hurt it a little. A most valuable picture as showing Titian's early brush-work, free at least from repaintings. The face and hand of Christ have been rubbed but the damage is not important. The work is a joy to look at, with or without a glass, because the brush of Titian, its freedom and accuracy, its skill, its wonderful fusing power can be traced everywhere. How beautifully the hair is done, the eyes drawn, the nose and mouth modelled, the beard and moustache brushed in! What superb heads with substantial bone structure under them! And, again, what beautifully drawn hands! The colour is not so rich here as it was later in Titian's career, but what could go beyond the beauty of the flesh-notes? For the mental conception, is it not full of dignity, calmness, serenity? Notice the contrast of types in the Christ and his questioner—the mildness of the one, the hard materialism of the other.

170. ——*Lavinia as a Bride.* A late work, but as one goes from the earlier Tribute-Money (No. 169) directly to this picture he finds a vast difference in the surfaces. This latter has a pasty and uncertain surface, with the whites lacking in quality

as the flesh-notes in value. The picture is much repainted and there is hardly a trace of Titian's brush left in it. Of course his brush-work changed as he grew older in his art, but it never arrived at the confused state here shown. This is the restorer's brush, not Titian's. Originally, no doubt, a fine portrait. See the alleged Rubens copy of it at Vienna (No. 844) in which many details here unseen are shown.

171. ——***Lavinia as a Matron.*** It has been cleaned and repainted to its ruin, somewhat after the manner of No. 170. Notice the hands and the pearls above the corsage line. At the left is something that may be a hat, a dog, or merely dabs of incoherent paint —across the gallery it seems to be feathers. There is still a fine pose to the figure and some colour.

172. * ——***Portrait of Antonio Palma.*** This is supposed by Mr. Herbert Cook to be a portrait of Palma Giovine because of the palm held in the left hand and the box of colours on the window-sill. The picture is somewhat injured but is still a noble portrait of Titian's late time. It is sombre in colour but compelling in its dignified poise. The hand and the sleeve at the right are now false in value and the sky is muddied, as also the grey ground back of the figure.

173. ——***Portrait of Young Woman with Vase.*** Look closely at the muffled and uncertain drawing of the right nostril, the left eye, the over-painted lips. Then consider the left hand with its fingers, the left arm, the thumbed and ruined beads around the neck, the flattened vase. It may have been Titian once but it is now ruined by restoration.

175. ——***Holy Family.*** The Madonna was once beautiful, no doubt, as also the wife of the donor at the right, but both are now much hurt. Why Titian? The woman in white is the only Titianesque figure and the landscape does not suggest him. It is probably a school piece of some sort.

176. ——***Woman in Red Dress.*** This is still rather fine in colour but the face and figure have become flat by repainting. It is now hung on the line, where the deformities of the hands cannot be avoided or overlooked and the ill-drawn table comes into notice. Probably Titian did it, but it is not in his usual style save in the well-drawn sleeves and the fine colour.

42A. **Tura, Cosimo.** ***St. Sebastian.*** It seems just a little more suave or gracious or compromising in method than we usually look for in Cosimo Tura, which lends colour to the belief of some critics that it is by a Tura follower. In its type and drawing, however, it gives indication of having been done by Tura's own hand. The shadows of the flesh are sooty. Notice the small figure in armour and the architecture at the top.

525. **Varotari, Alessandro (Il Padovanino).** ***Judith.*** Much repainted and now pulpy in the drawing (the hands and face), but it still has a nice sense of colour about it. It is an example of the early Decadence at Venice but not utterly worthless for that reason. Padovanino is here following Titian.

697. ** **Velasquez, Diego de Silva y.** ***Portrait of a Man.*** It is probably the portrait of Juan Mateos, the King's Master of the Hunt. The head is exceedingly well done. Notice the peculiar curling

hair, the eyes, the brows, the mouth and moustache, the powerful jaw, the twist of flesh in the neck. What a well-rounded and substantial body though only indicated! The hands are not ill drawn or repainted but merely sketched in. It is a fine portrait of a powerful man and more than likely by Velasquez's own hand. The colour suggests the painter of the portrait at Budapest (No. 311) and the same hand that did the Christ Bound to the Column in the London National Gallery (No. 1148), but the handling is different.

698. ——***Portrait of a Man.*** The picture has a fine silver-grey colouring but that is all that saves it. There is much repainting about the hair on the forehead and where it is dragged over the ear. The eyes, the collar, and other parts are now badly drawn. In its present state it is impossible to say whether or not Velasquez painted it. It belongs, of course, in his school and is a very acceptable portrait.

699. ——***Portrait of the Count Olivares.*** It is some sort of a school piece, with little to commend it except its probable likeness to the original. The drawing of it is loose, the handling of it too fluid, too uncertain for Velasquez. The high-lights on the sleeve and the greenish pattern are crudely done. Notice the weak drawing of the jaw, the flat nose, and the bad left eye.

221. **Venetian School.** ***Two Lovers.*** A picture of considerable interest because of its questionable authorship. It bears earmarks of Romanino or some one very close to him. The Romanino imitation of Giorgione is apparent in the shadows and flesh colour. It is carelessly drawn, darkly brown

in the shadows, with a landscape interesting and yet perplexing. See the catalogue note for the different attributions.

1335. * **Vermeer (or Van der Meer) of Delft, Jan.** ***The Proposal.*** One of the largest attributed Vermeers known and not altogether satisfactory, perhaps, because of its size. It was probably influenced or inspired by Carel Fabritius. Perhaps Fabritius himself painted it. The repainted hands of the man are heavy in drawing, the table-cloth is erratic and too prominent, the colour scheme is startling and not very harmonious. The reds and yellows are brilliant, high-keyed, but insufficiently modulated by shadow, wanting in true values, and not in tone with the figures at the left. And the whole picture lacks in atmosphere. The figures are pushed forward and the attempt to make those at the back recede by placing them in shadow is not effective. An important work, surely, but not suggestive in any way of Vermeer's smaller work and not at all like the large figure piece at The Hague (No. 406) or the Jesus and Martha of the Coats Collection. One wonders if Vermeer did it. The pictures assigned to him are too varied for one man, and this one has about it a suggestion of Fabritius. But a fine work. Look at the still-life or (independently considered) the rug.

1336. ** ——***A Girl Reading.*** A singularly beautiful Vermeer, quite perfect in its light, its colour, and its handling. It is as remarkable for its truth of tone, beauty of colour, and atmospheric setting as No. 1335 is not. How exactly, yet easily, the little lady holds her place not only in the linear perspective of the room but in the light and air of the room!

Study that light and air for a moment. They are wonderful. The curtain rod at the top repeats the picture-frame and is slightly jarring. The curtain at the back of the window is just right in value, as is also the lady's face reflected in the window-glass. A very simple composition but full of dignity, colour charm, and pictorial beauty of the highest kind, showing again and yet again how a slight theme may be turned into great art in the hands of genius. Pull it to pieces; find fault with it if you can. It is about perfect and is one of the gems of the gallery.

1388A. **Vermeer of Haarlem, Jan.** ***View of the Dunes.*** With more truth to Holland than ever the Ruisdaels put forth, though in practically the same key of light. It has the breadth and sweep of a Koninck.

224. ** **Veronese, Paolo (Caliari).** ***Madonna with the Cuccina Family.*** This, with Nos. 225, 226, and 227, was done for the Cuccina Palace, in Venice, and certainly this No. 224 was done by Paolo's own hand. The fine portraits of the family, the lofty Madonna and Child, the well-drawn St. John, the columns, the curtain, the building, the sky all indicate Paolo very decisively. It is a noble picture in every way. Perhaps the finest part of it is the kneeling woman in red. What a figure, head, and face! And what a wonderful dress! The patron saint in white above her is a graceful foil and the figure in red at the right an equally graceful repetition. The picture seems not hurt by the two columns cutting through it from top to bottom and separating the saintly from the purely human. The action seems to flow on between the columns. Notice the little chil-

dren in the striped suits and their disposition in the picture.

225. * ——*Adoration of Magi.* The group of the kings and their followers comes in from the right in the form of a wave—the line rising to the shoulders of the negro king, then falling in the line of the horse's neck to the pages, again rising with the kneeling king's robe and carrying up by the Child over the head of Joseph. A noble throng of people in rich robes, attitudinising a bit (as the kneeling king, for instance), but still dignified, pictorial, magnificent. Notice the drawing of the robe of the kneeling king, or the red robe of the second king, or the barbaric garb of the negro king. A lofty Madonna, a graceful Child, a sturdy Joseph. At the back a suggestion of architecture and a blue-green sky. By Paolo's own hand.

226. ——*Marriage of Cana.* It is more than probable that Paolo lies under the repainting upon this canvas, but one can get at him only by faith and much groping among the figures and their drawing. Everything seems to have been gone over. Notice the legs of the central figure in dark orange (with the wine-glass), and they will suggest the rest of the story. Even the sky and architecture have lost their tone and quality. Originally a handsome group, well balanced and perhaps startling in light and colour. The architecture at the right still has brilliancy about it and the figures much life and spirit. It is now only Paolo in part and possibly was not more than that originally. Referred to as the little Marriage in Cana to distinguish it from the great Marriage in Cana in the Louvre.

227. ——*The Way to Calvary.* The group has little movement owing to the use of the horizontal line—something that Paolo might have been thought too wise to have employed here. The figures are fairly well done, and the robes of the Christ are rightly drawn, but there is a feeling of smallness in the types and dulness in the colours that speaks against the picture being by Paolo's hand. The little white figures in the distance are, too, a peculiarity of Carlo Caliari. It is, however, a good picture, and probably Paolo designed it and worked upon it in part. It belongs in the Cuccina Palace series, though that would not disprove its being a workshop piece.

229. ——*Finding of Moses.* The types here are smaller in scale than in No. 227, below it, but this seems to be more like Paolo's work in every way. The two women at the left are slight, perhaps just a little too elegant, but nobly seen, well drawn, and well painted. Just so with the kneeling figure with the child, or the man with the halberd, or the landscape at the back. It may not be by Paolo, but it is, at any rate, well done. Such works as this, with its companion piece (No. 228), were no doubt much worked upon by pupils in the shop.

236. * ——*Portrait of Daniele Barbaro.* A commanding portrait, given with great dignity, simplicity, and good taste. How simply but nobly the man rests, looking straight at us, without fear or reproach. Notice the well-drawn, aristocratic hand and the handsome columns. It is less injured than many other portraits here—is, in fact, in very good shape. An excellent work.

231. ——*Crucifixion.* A small picture by some follower of Paolo. It is not badly grouped in the figures

and the colour, though cool, is very good. It may be a copy or a variation of some Veronese picture.

230. ——***The Good Samaritan.*** The landscape is rather maze-like, but good, nevertheless, and the figures come in as colour spots very well; but it is questionable if Paolo had anything to do with putting them in.

228. ——***The Centurion of Capernaum.*** It is a companion piece to No. 229 and yet it does not seem to be by the same hand. It is probably a school piece executed by pupils after Paolo's design.

1544. **Vries, Abraham de.** ***Portrait of a Man.*** A smooth-surface portrait but done with very precise drawing and easy handling. The light and shade of it are good as also the characterisation. Not a marvel, but just good Dutch portraiture.

1381. * **Vroom, Cornelis.** ***Wood Road.*** A landscape almost as modern in spirit as a Dupré or a Rousseau. What a fine sky! Notice the way it is brushed in. Also the depth of the forest. No. 1382 is like it but perhaps not so well done. They are much better as the simple transcripts of things seen than the conventional landscapes of Ruisdael or Hobbema. They have been attributed to Vermeer of Haarlem and are not too certainly placed now, but their value as art is not affected thereby.

800. **Weyden, Roger van der, Workshop of.** ***Christ on the Cross.*** A school piece, no doubt, but a good picture and in the Van der Weyden style. It is fine in its tragic sentiment, its colour, and its simple little landscape. Notice the bow of promise in the sky back of the figure of Christ.

1491B. **Wynants, Jan.** ***The Road.*** A very good Wynants in light, air, distance, and ensemble. It seems all of a piece, with foreground and background well held together, which is not always the case with his larger work.

Ysenbrant. See Isenbrant.

696. **Zurbaran, Francisco de.** ***Election of the Pope.*** One of the St. Bonaventura series of which there are two canvases in the Louvre and one in the Berlin Gallery. It is well drawn in the ecclesiastical gowns as in the hands of the kneeling St. Bonaventura. The figures are well grouped but a little false in value—that is to say, the cardinals in the background have about the same value or intensity of red as the table-cloth in the foreground. With dark shadows and some blackness of ground.

INDEX OF PICTURES BY NUMBERS

7. Angelico, Fra.
8, 9. Botticelli.
13, 14, 15. Credi.
20. Piero di Cosimo.
21. Capponi.
22. Florentine School.
31. Sienese School.
41. Pinturicchio.
42. Palmezzano.
42A. Tura.
43. Cossa.
45, 46. Roberti.
48, 49. Francia.
51. Mantegna.
52. Antonello da Messina.
53. Bellini, School of.
59A. Barbari, Jacopo de'.
60. Previtali.
61, 63. Cima.
64A. Catena.
68. Bevilacqua.
75. Franciabigio.
76, 77. Sarto, A. del.
80. Bacchiacca.
93. Raphael.
102. Sebastiano del Piombo.
103. Romano, Giulio.
107, 108. Baroccio.
113. Bagnacavallo.
123. Mazzolino.
124–128. Dossi.
131. Dossi, School of.
132–135, 140. Garofalo.
142, 144. Girolamo da Carpi.
149A. Ferrarese School.
150–155. Correggio.
168–173, 175, 176. Titian.
185. Giorgione.
186. Giorgione, School of.
188–192. Palma Vecchio.
194A. Lotto.
201. Morando.
201A. Bartolommeo Veneto.
203, 204, 205. Bordone.
208. Bonifazio.
221. Venetian School.
223. Farinato.

224–231–236 Veronese, P.
249. Fasolo.
252A. Bassano, Jacopo.
265A–266–267–269 Tintoretto.
276. Greco, Il.
281–282–283–323 Bassano, Leandro.
324–329–330 Reni, Guido.
509. Dolci.
525. Varotari.
601A. Guardi.
604. Belotto.
676. Roelas.
682–683 Ribera.
696. Zurbaran.
697–698–699 Velasquez.
703B–704–705 Murillo.
721. Poussin.
730–731 Claude Lorraine.
799. Eyck, Jan van.
800. Weyden, R. van der
808. Flemish School.
809–809A Cleve, Juste van.
810–811 Orley.
831. Beuckelaer.
839. Isenbrant.
840. Dutch School.
843. Engelbrechtsen.
846. Dutch School.
847. Moro.
892. Brueghel the Elder, Jan.
955–958A–960–962–962A–962B–962C–964A–964B–965–986B Rubens.
1009–1012 Jordaens.
1017–1021A–1022–1023A–1023B–1023C–1023D–1024–1025–1027–1028–1029–1030–1033–1034–1035 Dyck, Anthony van.

1058, 1059 Brouwer.
1077. Teniers.
1094. Ryckaert.
1158, 1159 Gysels.
1225. Heem.
1258. Knupfer.
1315, 1316, 1317 Mierevelt.
1335, 1336 Vermeer of Delft.
1338A, 1338C Goyen, Van.
1347, 1351 Netscher.
1358, 1359 Hals.
1371. Heda.
1381. Vroom.
1383. Ruysdael, S. van.
1388A. Vermeer of Haarlem.
1390, 1391 Poorter.
1398. Ostade, A. van.
1491B. Wynants.
1492, 1494, 1496, 1498, 1500, 1502, 1503, 1504 Ruisdael, J. van.
1544. Vries.
1556–1571 Rembrandt.
1573, 1575 Rembrandt, School of.
1582. Lievens.
1587. Backer.
1589, 1589A Koninck, S. van.
1591. Fabritius, B.
1595. Helst, Van der.
1600, 1602 Flinck.
1603, 1604, 1605 Bol.
1612A. Koninck, P.
1618, 1618A Eeckhout.
1629, 1630 Potter.
1664A, 1665 Hobbema.
1671. Neer, E. van der.
1704, 1720 Dou.
1726, 1727 Steen.
1732, 1736 Metsu.
1742. Mieris.
1782. Cuyp, A.
1791, 1792, 1792A Gelder
1805. Jongh.

1829–1832 Terborch.
1835–1838 Everdingen.
1869–1871 Dürer.
1888. Breu.
1889–1890 Holbein the Younger.
1901. Maler von Ulm.
1905. German School.
1906E–1906H, 1908–1916A, 1917 Cranach the Elder.
1946. Cranach the Younger.
1952. Cranach, School of.

3 9001 01812 9372

V345

No. [redacted]

Carnegie Free Library

TUCSON, ARIZONA

RULES FOR LENDING BOOKS

Any taxpayer of Tucson may borrow books from the Library by signing the Registration Cards furnished at the Library.